A DEFENCE OF THE PAPERS Written by the Late KING Of Blessed Memory, AND Duchess of York, AGAINST The ANSWER made to Them.

By Command.

LONDON,
Printed by *H. Hills*, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty for His Houshold and Chappel. 1686.

PREFACE.

IS acknowledg'd, that Sovereign Princes, when They enter into the Lists of Disputation, may be answer'd, as well as Private Men: for then they Command not, but only Argue, speak their Opinion, and Instruct. The Answerer is not therefore blam'd for appearing on the contrary Side to our late Sovereign of Blessed Memory, whose Papers were for that Reason made Public, that every man might have the liberty of considering them, and of making a free and upright Judgment concerning them. Accordingly it hath pleas'd Almighty God, by means of them, to open the Understanding, and direct the Will of many sober and well-meaning Readers, in the knowledge of his only True Church, and the desire of being united to it. The great Success of them, as it is manifest to the World,

ſo in all probability hath occaſion'd the Anſwer, by one who calls himſelf a Son of the Church of England; *and who gives it as the Reaſon of the publiſhing his Pamphlet,* That the Papers thus diſpers'd in Print, may fall into many Hands, who, without ſome Aſſiſtance, may not readily reſolve ſome Difficulties ſtarted by them. *Upon which Conſideration, this Author thought it* not unbecoming his Duty to God and the King, to give a clearer Light to the Things contained in them: *Which not long after he explains, in relation at leaſt to the Firſt Paper,* wherein he could have been glad to have found as much Reaſon to convince, as there was a fair Appearance to deceive. *Now whether the King intended to deceive his People, or that the Deceit might be occaſion'd by His Writings, I leave our Author to expound. But in general, to clear Difficulties, and diſcover a Couſenage, I freely grant, not to be unbecoming of our Duty. An Anſwer then may be made, even to a King; but the Manner of Anſwering is likewiſe to be conſider'd. And ſurely there is ſomewhat more of Reſpect to be given to a Sovereign Prince, than to a common or private*

vate Diſputant; eſpecially if the Anſwerer be his Subject. The Cardinal of Peronne, *tho' a Forreigner, has obſerv'd this Decency in the Controverſie manag'd betwixt our King* JAMES *the Firſt and him.* Luther, *on the other ſide, has made a* German *Quarrel with* HENRY *the Eighth, without allowing Him ſo much as the Name of King; but in the beginning of his Anſwer, calling Him barely by His Chriſtn'd Name, and uſing Him afterward as familiarly and ſcurrilouſly, as if* Martyn *and* Harry *had been two* Sophiſters, *ſet up to wrangle in the Schools, at their two confronting Desks. After the ſame manner, and not without a convenient ſhare of Impudence, has* Milton *treated King* CHARLES *the Firſt; but he had caſt off the Yoke of Dominion before he anſwer'd, and of a Subject was become a Rebel. To ſpeak evil of Dignities, is not much recommended to us in the Holy Scriptures: and whether he be* Catholic *or* Proteſtant, (Tros Rutulusve fuat-----) *who manages a Diſpute in this manner, neither Church ought to be over-proud of ſuch a Champion. Now whether our Anſwerer has follow'd the Example of* Peronne, *or whether he has not ſome little*

tincture

tincture of Luther's *Mannerlineſs, and the Civility of* Milton, *let the impartial Readers of his Pamphlet, nay, let even all modeſt and dutiful Proteſtants be Judges. I name not here the Paſſages, which are either diſreſpectful in relation to the Late King, or to the Preſent, nor the Pedantique Cavils, nor the private Scoffs, which have render'd our Author juſtly odious to the ſober Men even of his own Party: But if he will look upon this as a bare Accuſation, without Proof, I ſhall endeavour to make it good upon his Summons. In the mean time, tho', as he alledges, it be no Reflection on the Authority of a Prince, for a private Subject to examine a Piece of Coin as to its juſt Value, notwithſtanding that it bears his Image and Superſcription on it; yet the Anſwerer ought to be cautious of decrying that Coin among his Fellow-Subjects, unleſs he can fully prove it to be Counterfeit: But he might have made a more proper, and leſs invidious Similitude, by comparing the King's Paper to a Medal, rather than to Coin'd Money; It bears the Figure of one Monarch, and is Diſtributed to the People by another: 'Tis a Largeſs, not impos'd on any Man; it may either be taken,*

or

or refus'd. But both those Actions ought to be accompanied with Respect; the Metal and the Weight may be examin'd, without phillipping it up into the Air: for the Image, the Superscription, and the Donor, ought all to secure it from Contempt.

To conclude, If the Answerer thinks it not unbecoming his Duty to God and the King, to give a clearer Light to the Things contain'd in those Papers, I know it not to be unbecoming mine, to defend the Honour of both our Princes, and the Truth of that Religion profes's'd by them, which has descended without interruption from our Blessed Saviour and his Apostles, even to us. In so doing, I hope I shall discover the foul Dealing of this Author, who has obscur'd, as much as he is able, the Native Lustre of those Papers, and recommended by a false Light his own sophisticated Ware; part of which may certainly deserve the cleareſt Light which can be given it by the Hands of the Under-Sheriff, or of somebody whom I will not name.

A DEFENCE OF THE PAPERS

Written by

The late KING of Bleſſed Memory, and Ducheſs of *York*,

AGAINST

The Anſwer made to Them.

A Defence of the Firſt Paper.

AS I think the Anſwerer may, with as little need of Apology, become the Antagoniſt, as I the Champion of a King and Princeſs, and that the cowardiſe of delaying Time, ſuits ill with the Preſumption of entring into ſuch a Quarrel; I

ſhall loſe none in ſcanning the Preliminary Diſcourſes of my Adverſary, or making any for my ſelf.

His Majeſty ſays in his firſt Lines, That *it is as viſible, as that the Scripture is in Print, that none can be the One Church which Chriſt has here on Earth, but that which is called the Roman Catholic Church*; and that there is no need to *enter into the Ocean of Particular Diſputes, when the main, and in truth only Queſtion is, Where that Church is.*

The Anſwerer, who had a mind to flouriſh, before he offered to paſs, ſays firſt: That *if particular Controverſies could be ended, by a Principle as viſible as that the Scripture is in Print, all Men of ſence would ſoon give over Diſputing.* And what if they did? The ſooner, the better, I ſhould think. For Chriſtians, ſure, might without any harm become unanimous in their Sentiments, all of one Heart, and one Soul again, and lay Diſputing aſide: As truly I believe they would, if the Apoſtle could prevail with them, to lay aſide all Anger, and Malice, and Indignation. For Diſputes, alas! continue, not becauſe Truth is not viſible, but becauſe Men will not ſubmit their Sence to Grace, but ſtrain it, in ſtead of ending Diſputes, to keep them up, and render inviſible the moſt viſible things in the World.

In our preſent Caſe, if His Majeſty, in ſtead of *as viſible*, had ſaid, the Church is *more viſible* than Scripture, He would have had a very great Man to take His part. For which do's the Anſwerer think is the more viſible of the two, the thing *which is ſeen*, or that *by which it is ſeen*? And he knows who ſaid, *I would not believe the Goſpel, unleſs the Authority of the Catholic Church had moved me.*

Ego verò Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Catholicæ Eccleſiæ commoveret Authoritas. *Aug. cont. Epiſt. Fund. c.* v.

And

And this is, in truth, the Case of every Body. But evidently S. *Augustin*'s Eyes, as good as they were, did not see the Scripture, but by the Catholic, that is, the *Roman* Catholic Church. For that, the Answerer knows, was the Catholic Church with which he communicated.

Then he gives a Reason why Disputing would cease, *viz.* Because *none who dare believe what they see, can call* Scriptures being in Print *in question*; which by making nothing visible, which can be called in question, makes it not visible that Scripture is in Print. For he knows the far greatest part of Mankind, all Infidels and Mahumetans, do actually call Scripture in question at this day; he knows many Christians have questioned divers Parts of it heretofore; and He himself still questions some, as visibly in Print as any of the rest. But to question whether the Book in Print be Scripture, is manifestly to question whether Scripture be in Print. And so in one breath he says *it is*, in the next *it is not visible* that Scripture is in Print. But we will not fall out about Matters which import not.

But, goes he on, *what if the Church, whose Authority it is said they must submit to, will not allow them to believe what they see*? Why then that Church, if he take Believing *strictly*, agrees with all Mankind. For as every body knows that Faith is *of things not seen*, none can allow we properly believe what we see. But if he take the Word *largely*, I know of no Church which allows not People to believe all they see. I do indeed know of one, which would be glad People would not believe they see, what they see not, nor by their Senses can see. An Eye may see the Colour of a thing, and an Ear

Argumentum non apparentium. *Heb.* 11.

hear the Sound it makes, &c. but what this coloured, or ſounding thing is, often needs more than the Senſes to diſcover. For the *What* of a thing is not the Object of any Senſe.

How then, ſays he, *can this be a ſufficient Reaſon to perſuade them to believe the Church, becauſe it is as viſible as that the Scripture is in Print?* I am ſorry, that to know our Duty, is not with him ſufficient reaſon to do it. We all know by the Evangeliſt, that *Chriſt* left Commiſſion *to teach all Nations*; and by the Apoſtle, that there are *Paſtors and Doctors appointed to build us up into the Unity of Faith, and prevent our being Circumvented by Errour.* And whatever he do's, I take it to be my Duty to learn of thoſe, who are appointed, and have Commiſſion from *Chriſt* to teach, when 'tis viſible who they are.

His following conceit of uſing and renouncing our Senſes, and indeed, all hitherto ſaid, might have very well been ſpar'd: For there is nothing yet which relates to our Buſineſs. If he thinks Kings and their Writings are not above Sporting, the Matter I am ſure is.

The ſubſtance of what he ſays, when he thinks to paſs in earneſt, is, 1. That *a Part is not the Whole*, and the *Roman* he takes to be only a part of the Catholic Church. 2. That *Roman Catholic* is an Expreſſion found, neither in *the Creeds, nor Office of Baptiſm* even at preſent. 3. That the *Roman do's not her ſelf believe ſhe is the Catholic Church of the Creeds*, becauſe ſhe admits the validity of Baptiſm adminiſtred out of her Communion. And laſtly, That there *may be different Communions of Chriſtians, which may ſtill continue parts of the Catholic Church*;

Church; for instance, the Holy Bishops and Martyrs, who, he says, were Excommunicated heretofore in *Asia* and *Afric*, and the Eastern Christians at this Day.

For his first Riddle of a *Part*, and *Whole*, we may thank his Inadvertence. The Paper do's not say, that the *Roman* is the *Catholic Church*; but that the *Roman Catholic is the one Church of Christ*. As *Roman* alone may signify the Diocess under the immediate Government of the Bishop of *Rome*, which never did, nor can more pretend to be the Catholic Church, than the Church of *Laodicea*, or *Ephesus*, or any other particular Church; the Paper by joyning Catholic to it, shews it speaks of her, and all joyn'd in Communion with her, and all who believe as her Communion believes, whether they be joyn'd in External Communion or no. For it is apparent, by his Majesties talking all along of matters of Faith, and no where of any thing else; that he minded nothing but Faith, and considered the Church with respect only to Faith. Now I beseech him, is this *Roman Catholic*, ever the less visibly the one Church of *Christ*, because a Part is not a Whole? Of what will he make that Whole, but of all the Parts? And do's not *Catholic* signify all the Parts? Or is it the less Catholic; is any part taken out, because the particular *Roman* is put in? By the way, because He often mentions the *Roman Church*, without adding *Catholic*, let me here, to avoid Repetitions, declare once for all, That I shall understand him of the *Roman Catholic*, wherever the Circumstances of the place determine not the Sense to the particular Church of *Rome*. For he means not I suppose, to talk of one Church, while His Majesty talks of another.

Upon

Upon the Second Head, he asks, *If thoſe who made the Creeds for our direction, had intended the Roman Catholic Church, why was it not ſo expreſſed?* He might have anſwered himſelf. For he knows, as well as I, that the Reaſon was, becauſe Language always changes with Times. As there were no ſuch Dreams of the *Roman* Church, when the Creeds were made, as now, it had been a very ſuperfluous, and a very unaccountable piece of Care, to have ſaid *Roman* in a Word by it ſelf, which was already ſaid by the Word *Catholic*, and ſo by all the World underſtood. Now there are who will have her, ſome a corrupt Part of the Catholic Church, ſome none at all; who have a mind to let People know, they take her for a Part, and a ſound, and the principal Part, and yet would ſave Words, have light on a thrifty way of ſaying all in ſhort, by *Roman-Catholic.*

He ſays beſides, That this *Limitation*, as he calls it, *of the Senſe of Chriſt's Catholic Church to the Roman, was never put to Perſons to be Baptiz'd, in any Age of the Church.* And, That *he finds not in the Office of Baptiſm, that it is required that they believe the Roman Catholic Church.* As if the *Roman* Baptiſm by requiring belief of the Catholic, did not require belief of the *Roman* Catholic Church. If he think in earneſt that it do's not, let him preſent a Man to this Baptiſm, who profeſſes not to believe the *Roman* Catholic Church, and try whether his profeſſing to believe the Catholic Church will obtain it. He reflects not that the Limitation, which is in this Expreſſion, *Roman Catholic Church*, comes not from *Roman*, but from *Church.* That Word indeed always limits the Expreſſion to thoſe who believe,

lieve, and ſometimes to thoſe who practiſe the Doctrine of Chriſt. *Roman* neither makes nor marrs, as to Limitation, but owns the *Romans* for ſuch Chriſtians. Taking in thoſe, whom Injuſtice would keep out, is, it ſeems, Limitation in his Language.

As it griev'd him in likelihood, that this Expreſſion, *as viſible as that the Scripture is in Print*, ſhould be applied to the *Roman* Catholic Church, he had a mind to retort it upon her; but very unluckily chuſes to do it, in an Aſſertion contrary to the ſenſe of all the World, beſides himſelf; and by an Argument contrary to the ſenſe of the whole Church, not excepting his own. He ſays then, in his third Head, That *it is to him* equally *viſible, that the Church of* Rome *it ſelf do's not believe that it is the one Catholic Church mentioned in the two Creeds*; and this every body, but he, plainly ſees it do's: And proves it by this Argument, Becauſe, if it did, *it muſt void all Baptiſm out of its Communion, which it hath never yet done*; when 'tis plain, that all the Church agrees, it ought not to be voided. This he very well knows is a Plea over-ruled by the whole Church many Ages ago, and which I little expected he would have borrow'd from Men, who, he ſays, were excommunicated, becauſe they made, and ſtood to it; eſpecially whi[illegible] he, I think condemns it himſelf. For he excludes the *Donatiſts*, I ſuppoſe, and *Novatians* from the Catholic Church, becauſe they re-baptized. When he bethinks himſelf, he will not ſure have the Church heretofore not believe her ſelf the Catholic Church, becauſe ſhe would not void Baptiſm with the Re-baptizers; nor exclude the *Engliſh* from the Catholic Church, becauſe ſhe voids it not. The truth is to ſay in one breath, That the

Donatiſts

Donatiſts were not Catholics, becauſe they Re-baptized; and in the next, That *Roman* Catholics cannot believe themſelves Catholics, becauſe they do not, is a croſs piece of Buſineſs, and much too hard for me. As far as I can underſtand, the very Reaſon he gives why they ſhould not, is one Reaſon why they ſhould believe themſelves the Catholic Church. For, in not voiding the Baptiſm of Heretics, they do as the Primitive Catholic Church did. And had I made ſuch an Argument for a Friend, I am afraid he would have thought I plaid booty.

The Anſwerer nevertheleſs ſtrives to make it good by this Diſcourſe: *As long as Baptiſm doth enter Perſons into the Catholic Church, it is impoſſible that all who have the true Form of Baptiſm, though out of the Communion of the* Roman *Church, ſhould be Members of the Catholic Church, and yet the Communion of the* Roman *and* Catholic *be all one; as it muſt be, if the* Roman *Church be the Catholic and Apoſtolic Church profeſſed in the Creeds.* This, if I underſtand it, is in ſhort; Perſons Baptized out of the *Roman* Communion, are Members of the Catholic, but not of the *Roman* Catholic Church; and therefore the Catholic, and *Roman* Catholic, are not the ſame Churches.

He was not, I perceive, aware, that he ſuppoſes what he ſhould prove, and when he has done, proves it by means of that Suppoſition: For he could not make a Member of the Catholic, not to be a Member of the *Roman Catholic*, unleſs he ſuppoſe that thoſe are two different Churches. And this is the very Point in Diſpute, which he ſhould prove, and which he puts for proved in his Concluſion. But we are all ſubject to overſights.

I wonder

I wonder more how it could ſcape him, that the Baptized Perſons he ſpeaks of, are as much Members of both Churches, as of either. (I ſpeak in his Language, as if they were diſſerent Churches, that his Argument may go on.) Thoſe Perſons are not truly Members either of the Catholic, or *Roman* Catholic Church; but as far as Baptiſm makes Members, they are altogether as much Members of the *Roman* Catholic, as of the Catholic. And He, if he will recollect himſelf, knows very well, that both Points have been long ſince determin'd, and that by the whole Catholic Church.

The old Conteſt, about Rebaptiſation, puts it paſt Diſpute, that they were not truly Members of any Part of the Catholic Church. For the Conteſt was, How they ſhould be made Members? Whether by a new Baptiſm, or only by Impoſition of Hands? Both Sides therefore, that is, the whole Church, agreed, That they were not Members of the Church, till, one way or other, they were receiv'd into it. And to think they did not agree in this, is to make very wiſe Men of them; Men who fell out with one another, even to Excommunication, if we will believe the Anſwerer, how thoſe ſhould be brought into the Church, who were in already. Again, That they were nevertheleſs as much Members of the Catholic Church, tho' baptiſed out of its Communion, and ſo of the *Roman*, tho' baptiſed out of the *Roman* Communion, as Baptiſm could make them, he knows too was carried againſt the Re-baptiſers by the reſt of the Church, in whoſe Judgment the whole Church ever ſince has acquieſced. And he ſtands ſingle againſt that Judgment, when he thinks a Man baptiſed out of the *Roman* Communion, is not

a Member of the *Roman* Communion, as much as Baptiſm makes a Member, and as much as if he were baptiſed in her Communion.

In truth, there is nothing to diſpute of, but Words. When he ſays, that Baptiſm *enters* the Baptiſed into the Catholic Church, if he mean, that thoſe who are duly baptiſed by Men who are out of the Communion of the Catholic Church, need no other Baptiſm to be brought into the Catholic Church, he ſays very true, and no more than what the whole Church has long ſince ſaid before him. Neither do they need any other Baptiſm to be brought into the *Roman*. And if he will have this called an *entry*, and the Baptiſed called *Members*, with all my heart. For I think it time loſt, to quarrel about the Names of things, when we know what they ſignifie. But if he mean, that their Baptiſm ſo enters them, that they need nothing more, to be what every body underſtands by Members, Men who believe and profeſs the Faith of the Catholic Church, he contradicts every Member of the Catholic Church, and every Man in the World. For all Men ſee they do not profeſs that Faith, but the Hereſies of their Baptiſers; and all Chriſtians know they need, notwithſtanding their Baptiſm, to be receiv'd into the Church; and that there goes Faith, as well as Baptiſm, to a Member of the Body of Faithful. And as Faith ſignifies an Aſſent to the Doctrine of Chriſt, the Anſwerer, ſure, will not ſay, that they have Faith, who, far from aſſenting, contradict the Doctrine of Chriſt; and ſo make the Church a Congregation, no longer of *Faithful*, but of *Faithful* and *not Faithful*.

There is more ado about the laſt Head, and nothing

thing all the while to the Question. The substance is, That some have been cast out of Communion *upon particular Differences, which were not supposed to be of such a nature, as to make them no Members of the Catholic Church:* That therefore *there may be different Communions among Christians, which may still continue Parts of the Catholic Church:* And that *consequently no one Member of such a Division ought to assume to it self the Title and Authority of the One Catholic Church.* And what is all this, even supposing it all true, to the Question of the Paper, *Whether the Roman Catholic be the One Catholic Church of the Creeds?*

Suppose his divided Christians do continue Parts still of the Catholic Whole; cannot the *Roman* Catholic therefore be that Whole? Suppose no one Member of the Division ought to assume to it self the Title and Authority of the One Catholic Church; ought not therefore both, and all the Members to assume it? What is, or can there be, to assume it besides? Or would he not have it assumed at all, but the Name of Catholic Church banish'd out of the World by every such Division which happens in it?

His Majesty, as I observ'd before, included in the *Roman* Catholic Church, of which He speaks, all Christians whom a different Faith excluded not, and said that this Church, or these All, are the One Catholic Church of the Creeds. The Answerer, to shew they are not, tells us, That among these All, there may be Divisions, notwithstanding which, they may remain Parts still of the Catholic Church. Why, if they remain Parts of the Catholic Church, they are of the number of the All, who make it up, and remain Parts of His Majesty's *Roman* Catholic

Church, which takes All in. Is that Church ever the leſs *Catholic*, by having never ſo many Members? Or ever the leſs *One*, becauſe divided Chriſtians believe as ſhe do's? For if they do not, She and They both cannot be Members of one Catholic Church, and the Anſwerer muſt needs exclude either Her or Them.

For it being as palpable Nonſence, that one Church can be with more than one Faith, as that one Man can be with more than one Soul; the Churches, which make up the Catholic Apoſtolic One Church, can have but one Faith among them All: And who knows the Faith of any one, knows the Faith of all the reſt. Now ſince the Anſwerer, with his Compliment of *Corrupt* Faith, (which, as Compliments often are, is Nonſence too) makes the *Roman* Catholic a Part, at leaſt, of the one Catholic Whole, all the other Parts muſt believe as ſhe do's, or cannot themſelves be Parts. And ſo his Reaſon, why All thoſe who believe as ſhe do's are not the Catholic Church, is becauſe All believe as ſhe do's, notwithſtanding ſome Diviſions.

As it is not to our purpoſe, I inquire not whether his divided Chriſtians do indeed, by continuing the ſame Faith, properly continue parts of the Catholic Church; a Queſtion which belongs to the propriety of Language; nor how far ſo much Title to the Church avails to their Salvation. Since Diviſions, eſpecially of long continuance, ſeem hardly conſiſtent with Charity, and Charity is as neceſſary to Salvation as Faith, I pray God of his Mercy to preſerve me from ever being divided, whether I be ſaid to belong ſtill to the Church or no, and make them ſenſible of their condition who are. Neither will I

examine

examine how 'tis with the Eastern Christians at this Day, or was with those of *Afric* and *Asia*, whom he makes Excommunicated heretofore by the Bishops of *Rome*; a Point of which if he have a mind to Dispute, he may chuse his Man among those who deny it. Whether the *Roman Catholic*, comprehending all of the same Faith with her, be the one Catholic Apostolic Church of the Creeds, is our Question; not who they are, who have the same Faith. And that this *Roman Catholic* Church is the One Church which *Christ* has on Earth, or that he has none on Earth, is as visible as that Scripture is in Print, or any thing more visible, if any thing can be. For if it be not, we must look for *Christ*'s Church, either among Infidels, who believe not in *Christ* at all, or Heretics, who believe not his Doctrine. And there, I for my part despair to find it.

The truth is, I suspect by his talking, that he would be content People should think, that the one Catholic Church of the Creeds, requir'd not any one Faith, but were made up of as many Men as own *Christ*, whatever they believe of his Doctrine: Except, perhaps, those who Rebaptise, and those who assume the Title of the Catholic Church. By which means the notion of *Catholic* would be well enough provided for, but *One* and *Church* left to shift for themselves. But he do's not directly say it, and 'tis not fair to put my suspitions to his account.

Divers other Passages there are in his Discourse which relish not with me. He by saying the Visible Church might have been easily shewn in the first Blessed Times, insinuates, she is less visible now, or rather invisible; for visible things may be easily seen at all times: And I conceive the same marks, which shew'd

ſhew'd her then, will with as little difficulty ſhew her now. Chriſtians were then admoniſh'd to mind thoſe *who abide in the Doctrine of* Chriſt; who *come and bring not that Doctrine*; and to *contend for the Faith once delivered to the Saints.* And we have but to do ſo ſtill.

Again, I comprehend not how his unheeded, and yet remarkable difference between People caſt out of Communion, *viz.* That *ſome did, and ſome did not challenge the Title of the Catholic Church*, was the cauſe of any great miſapplication. It ſounds as if he would have that Title never rightly apply'd, but to thoſe who do not challenge it, in likelihood becauſe they have no pretence to it. But I leſs underſtand how it comes to be *Preſumption* and a *cauſe of Schiſms* in one part of a Diviſion to aſſume it. It is not well intelligible, when there is a Diviſion, how more than one part can bear it. For the Language of the World has always preſerv'd that Title to one Part, and given the name of Sect, or part cut off, to the other. And it is more unintelligible, how it ſhould be Preſumption in that one Part, to take what all the World gives, and that Preſumption be the cauſe of Schiſms, which happen'd, and of neceſſity always muſt happen before the Preſumption. For till there be Schiſm, that is, *Diviſion*, there cannot be *Part of a Diviſion* to preſume.

His account too of the breach betwixt the *Eaſt* and the *Weſt*, is, I think, very wide of the mark. He would have the Popes Supremacy bear the blame of all, which, if my Memory fail me not, was not ſo much as made a Pretence, till near Two hundred Years after the Schiſm began, nor any where more acknowledged than in *Greece*, nor by any body more,

more, than by him who began the Schism. When I read the Story, I apprehended the cause of that breach was National Feuds, heightned into violent hatred, by several Accidents which chopt unluckily in, and the malitious Ambition of Men, who found their private Accounts in the Public Calamity. Indeed I think they denied the Popes Supremacy at last, as all, who will continue in Schism, at long run must; because to acknowledge and not regard it, is self condemnation: Otherwise their Quarrel was to the Latin Church, or perhaps more truly, Nation, not the Supremacy, of which they speak so inconstantly, that I am persuaded it would break no squares even now, if they could be brought on any terms to agree with Men whom they hate. I would be more diligent in this Matter, if it concern'd our Question. But as they are parts of His Majesties *Roman* Catholic Church, if they believe as she do's, and are not if they do not, and it is equal whether they do or no, I leave them to Gods Mercy, and return from straying thus far, into our Road again.

This Principle being remov'd (which ought, he says, *be taken for granted, since it can never be prov'd*) By the way, he do's not, sure, mean this for a bob to the King, as if he took his Principle, *viz.* That *the Church is as visible as Scripture*, for granted, because he knew not how to prove it. Whether the Person to whom he directed his Paper were satisfy'd before hand of this Point by their former Discourses, or needed no Arguments to see a visible thing, or however it were, the Answerer may perceive by the Paper, that his Majesty thought it not to his purpose to press the Visibility of the Church, but only submission to it; and means not, I suppose, to tell the

King

King, he knew not his own Design, or how to purſue it. His part is to anſwer what *is* ſaid, and not inſtruct the King what *ſhould* have been ſaid. He muſt therefore mean, that it ought to be taken for granted, that he has remov'd that Principle, which is juſt, *I end me your Hand, Neighbour, to remove my Block; I cannot ſtir it my ſelf.* Alas! it is very viſible he has done nothing towards removing it. But he is in the right to play ſure. Who have a flaw in their Title, do well to get a Grant. By his ſaying *it can never be prov'd*, he has, I gueſs, a mind to tempt ſomebody to prove over again, what has been prov'd a hundred and a hundred times already. But as much as his poſitiveneſs tempts me to be doing, and as eaſie as I think it to be done, I beg his Pardon at preſent: Parrying is my buſineſs, not Thruſting now.

Whatever he mean, I do not think that what he concludes would follow, even tho' the Principle which he diſlikes were removed. The Principle is, *That the Roman Catholic is the One Church which Chriſt has here upon Earth*; and the Concluſion is, *That we muſt unavoidably enter into the Ocean of particular Diſputes.* Why ſo, I pray him? Why will not another Catholic Church ſerve turn? If he will needs have it granted, that the *Roman* Catholic is not the One Church of Chriſt, 'tis but ſhewing us the other Catholic which is. *Roman*, or *not Roman*, imports not. But believing the Doctrine of Chriſt, imports as much as Salvation is worth; and the Commiſſion which Chriſt gave to teach it the World, is now in force, and ſhall be as long as there is a World. Let him but direct us to the Men who have it in this Age, that we who live in this Age may

may learn it of them; let him but tell us which is the One, not *Roman* Catholic Church, which Christ has here upon Earth; and it will do our business every jot as well as the *Roman* Catholic, and as much save us from being plunged into the Ocean of particular Disputes. Otherwise, to tell us, the *Roman* Catholic is not that Church, and not tell us which is, is as much as to tell us, that Christ has none upon Earth. For evidently, She, or some other, must be that Church, if there be any at all. But let him not send us to a Church, whereof the several Parts agree not in one Faith. Besides that we should never understand how such a Church, let it be never so Universal, could be One, and make account Christ taught One determinate Doctrine, not the *I*, and the *No*, both; it would be otherwise useless. For if *This* Part teach one Faith, and the *Next* another, we should not know which to believe, and in all likelihood believe neither.

But *he knows no Reason any can have to be so afraid* of the Ocean of particular Disputes, *since we have so sure a Compass as the Holy Scripture to direct our Passage.* I am sure there can be no Reason to venture to Sea, when we are already safe in our Port; The Holy Scripture assures us, that the Church is *the Foundation and Pillar of Truth*, and Truth is plainly the Port to which his Compass should direct us. But pray what Compass can be sure, where the Needle is not suffer'd freely to play? Wrangling is Iron to this Needle, and turns it to all Points. It will indeed direct the humble, and docile, and the sincere, who *first know, that no Prophecy of Scripture is of private interpretation*, and we see it will, by the Third Paper. But it is not 2 Pet. 1. 20.

1 Cor. 11. 16. for the bold and ſelf-conceited Diſputers. *If any will be contentious, we have no ſuch cuſtom, nor the Church of God*, is what the Scripture it ſelf ſays to them. *To contend with them at Scripture*, *Tertullian* tells us, *is good for nothing, but to turn the Brain or the Stomach; and that we ought not to try it this way*, becauſe *the Iſſue will be uncertain, or but little certain, or none.* Alas! this Gentleman, with the ſecurity he promiſes, *errs* all this while, *not knowing the Scriptures*, nor ſo much as the End for which they were made. He would do well to remember what St. *Auſtin* ſays to him in Words directed to another. *If you will not have me believe Catholics, you are quite out, to think to draw me to you by Scripture, becauſe it was for their ſakes that I believed Scripture. You would indeed, if you could evidently prove your Doctrine by Scripture, invalidate the Authority of Catholics, who bid me not believe you. And when you have done, neither ſhall I believe the Scripture, which I had believed upon their Credit; and ſo what you alledge out of it, will be of no force with me. If you find it manifeſt for you, I ſhall neither believe Catholics nor you.* Here I will ſtop: For truly after ſo much ſaid of this Subject, and ſo long Experience of his ſure Compaſs, I grieve too much to diſpute it farther, when I obſerve that neither Reaſon nor Experience will do; and fear

Quoniam nihil proficiat congreſſio Scripturarum, niſi plane ut aut ſtomachi quis incat everſionem aut cerebri — Non ad Scripturas provocandum eſt: nec in his conſtituendum certamen, in quibus aut nulla aut incerta victoria eſt, aut parum certa. *Tertull. de Præſcrip. c.* 17, 19.

Si dixeris, noli Catholicis credere, non recte facies per Evangelium me cogere ad Manichæi fidem, quia ipſi Evangelio Catholicis prædicantibus credidi. Quod ſi forte in Evangelio aliquid apertiſſimum de Manichæi Apoſtolatu invenire poteris, infirmabis mihi Catholicorum authoritatem, qui jubent ut tibi non credam. Qua infirmata, jam nec Evangelio credere potero, quia per eos illi credideram, ita nihil apud me valebit, quicquid inde protuleris. Si inde aliquid manifeſtum pro Manichæo legeris, nec illis (credam) nec tibi. *Aug. cont. Ep. Fund. c.* 5.

fear there are who more desire the Ocean of Controversies should never be past, than truly think it will be past this way.

But he is merry, whatever I be. For sure he is in jest, when he talks of clear Evidence of Scripture against us, and the Church of *Romes* notoriously deviating from it. Under the Face he sets on this Matter, there is nothing in the World, but that he has the Art to make the Words of Scripture bear a Sense of his own, or Friends invention; no great matter to brag on, Alas! no not so much as for Learning. For even the Unlearned, he knows, have Wit enough to pervert the Scriptures to their own Perdition. And because the Church of *Rome* has no mind his Word should be past upon her for God's Word, he runs away with it, with a sure Compass, and clear Evidence, and the infallible Rule; Words, which, as big as they sound, signifie nothing but the Whimsies of possibly a single, possibly an unlearned Man; but yet who will needs be wiser than the Church. To take upon us to understand the meaning of the Books of Divine Mysteries, otherwise than by learning it of their Interpreters, when no Trade, the most trivial and easie, is learnt without a Master, and condemn what we understand not, as we do when we will not embrace that Meaning, is, not to mince his Words, *rash Pride*, in the Opinion of S. *Austin*.

2 Pet. 3. 16

Si unaquæque disciplina, quamquam vix alis & facilis ut percipi possit, doctorem aut magistrum requirit: quid temerariæ superbiæ plenius, quam divinorum Sacramentorum libros, & ab Interpretibus suis nolle cognoscere, & incognitos velle damnare

Aug. de Util. Cred. c. 17. tom. 6.

But to go on, the Answerer knows very well, that the meaning of his Majesties next Paragraph, is not what his Question would put upon it, and yet

he muſt needs ſuppoſe it has another, as if he did him Grace. His Majeſty asks no Grace of him, but to put the Period entire; *It is not left to every Phantaſtical Mans Head to believe as he pleaſes, but to the Church, to whom Chriſt left the Power on Earth,* where I think the Compoſitor has left out a Comma *to govern us in matters of Faith, who made the Creeds for our direction*; and then to underſtand Engliſh. But he will needs ſuppoſe the meaning is, that thoſe who reject *the Authority of the* Roman *Catholic Church, do leave every Man to believe according to his own Fancy.* Still he takes it not right. Not but that rejecting that Authority infers ſetting up private Fancy. But as inconſequent as it is, there are, who, for all their rejecting that greater Authority, are ſevere enough in requiring punctual obedience to their own little or no Authority, and this too viſibly for his Majeſty to ſay they do not. His words, I conceive, cannot fairly be ſuppos'd to extend farther, than they were directed, to a ſingle Perſon in all likelihood, who had the honour of his Confidence, and whom he thought fit to put in mind, That *it is not left to every Phantaſtical Mans Head to believe as he pleaſes.* What has the Anſwerer to ſay to this? is it true? or is it not true?

Certainly, ſays he, *thoſe of the Church of* England *cannot be liable to any Imputation of this Nature.* And who can tell by this, whether he ſay I, or no? or what kind of Anſwer that ſhould be which ſays neither? or what it ſerves for, but to do the Church of *England* the ſame good Office which they do themſelves, who, when Vice is ridicul'd on the Stage, fall out with the Actors or Poet, and will needs be the Fools of the Play.

But

But if he will be making needless Apologies, why must he needs make one fifty times worse than the attempt to make it? All Heretics since the first Four General Councils, may say the very same which he says for the Church of *England*, and all before them, the Equivalent. *Arius* himself could say, I receive the Apostles Creed, and why should more be requir'd of me, when that has hitherto been thought sufficient for all Christians? Moreover, I embrace all former Councils, but think I have very great reason to complain, that a Party in the Church, the most corrupt and obnoxious, assuming the Title of a General and Free Council, takes upon it self to define new Doctrine, which has neither universal Tradition (divers heretofore, and all the Orthodox, that is, my Abetters, being on my side) and so plainly no Scripture, that because they could find none there, they were fain to Coyn a new Word for their new Faith. *Macedonius*, *Nestorius*, and *Eutiches* might have said as much of the Creeds and Councils before them, and all Heretics since of the Creeds and Councils alledg'd by the Answerer, and all complain of the Villanous Factions, call'd General Councils. He has plainly justify'd them all, if it be a justification of a Doctrine, that it is not found condemned in Councils, held before it was broach'd. For the Doctrine of none of them was condemn'd by any former Council, nor indeed well could. For as Councils seldom meddle with more than the exigence, for which they were call'd, requires, it is not to be expected, that more Faith should be found in their Creeds or Acts, than was Controverted when they sat. Wherefore, unless one will fancy that every part of Christs Doctrine was denied so early,

early, or that no body ſince can deny ſome part, which was not denied then, it is as wild as unſeaſonable, to plead in behalf of a Doctrine now, that it was not condemn'd by the firſt Four General Councils, or Three Creeds, where there was no occaſion to mention it. And yet he thinks this an Apology fit to be made for the Church of *England*. Truly I have long thought, and there are of her Members who know my Thoughts, that ſhe has ill luck, when ſhe has much better things to ſay for her ſelf, to have ſuch things as theſe ſaid for her: things which fit the greateſt Enemies ſhe has, every jot as well as her ſelf; and which I therefore wonder not, when I ſee alledg'd by them, as Pleas for her. For They have reaſon, when They will not be brought to Her, to bring Her to Them, if they can. But to ſee them produc'd by thoſe who will be, even unſeaſonably zealous for her, is a Riddle, with which it is not for me to meddle.

What he adds, *of* holding *nothing contrary to any univerſal Tradition of the Church from the Apoſtles Times, and* putting *it upon that Iſſue*, (for *profeſſing* and *offering*, as he expreſſes it, is no great matter, unleſs they do what they profeſs and offer) is indeed to purpoſe, and ſpoken like a Friend of the Church of *England*, and a Lover of Peace. And I heartily wiſh, and as earneſtly, as I can, pray to Almighty God, that this Trial may be brought ſpeedily on; which I can ſafely undertake ſhall neither be declin'd, nor delay'd by the Church of *Rome*.

Then he paſſes on to her, and ſays, That *who believe her to be the Catholic, believe, as they pleaſe, without any colour of Scripture, Antiquity, or Reaſon.* This Ball has been toſt already, and in my Opinion enough.

enough. Only, leſt he, whoever *believe*, be thought to *ſpeak* as he pleaſes, he would do well to ſhew what Scripture or Reaſon tells him, that the *Roman* Church, with the reſt of her Belief, (for ſure he talks not of a Dioceſs) was not always believ'd the Catholic Church. Antiquity I know he has, as much as ſince *Luther*. Any other Colour, from all theſe three, I ſee none. Divers other Points he brings in, I know not why, unleſs that he has perhaps a mind to be ſailing on the Ocean of particular Diſputes. As I have not, I mean to ſtay on firm Ground, with S. *Auſtin*, and content my ſelf, that *It was thought fit by the Catholic Church ſpread throughout thē World, to obſerve what we hold:* And that, *Becauſe the things we hold are obſerv'd by the Univerſal Church, they are believ'd not otherwiſe deliver'd and recommended, than by the Apoſtles.* Who has a mind to put to Sea with the Anſwerer, will, I think, find the ſame Saint's Counſel good: *When he has been toſt enough, and has a mind to be at eaſe, to follow the way of Catholic Diſcipline, which deſcended from Chriſt himſelf, by the Apoſtles, even to us, and ſhall to Poſterity.*

Neque enim parvi momenti eſt, quod cum &c. Hoc per univerſam Catholicam, quæ toto orbe diffunditur, obſervari placuit, quod tenemus. *Auguſt. contr. Creſcon. l. 1. c 32.*

Quam conſuetudinem credo ex Apoſtolica traditione venientem, ſicut multa quæ non inveniuntur in litteris eorum, neque in Conciliis poſteriorum; & tamen quia per univerſam cuſtodiuntur Eccleſiam, non niſi ab ipſis tradita, & commendata creduntur. *Aug. de Bap. cont. Donatiſt. l. 2. c. 7.* Si jam ſatis tibi jactatus videris, finemque hujuſmodi laboribus vis imponere, ſequere viam Catholicæ diſciplinæ, quæ ab ipſo Chriſto per Apoſtolos ad nos uſque manavit, & abhinc ad poſteros manatura eſt. *Aug. de Util. Cred. c. 8.*

He ſhall, if he pleaſe, excuſe me from rambling after him into the Authority they allow the Church; which gay word, if it ſhould ſignify no more, as I ſuſpect it ſometimes do's not, than that it do's oblige People, whatever they think, to hold their Tongues, and not to thwart her deciſions in public, for fear of loſing

losing their Benefices, it were great pity: Like me into free Councils, and Factions, and what else he fills a Page with. For whatever he do, I remember our Question all the while is, whether it be well or ill said, *That it is not left to every Phantastical Man's Head to believe as he pleases.* And when he pleases to speak to it, I am for him.

In the next Section he tells us, That all *they plead for in this case, is the right which Loyal Subjects have under an Usurper, so far to interpret the Laws as to be able to understand their duty, &c.* I will not ask him who the Usurpers are, and who the Loyal Subjects? For he makes account, I find that to receive Faith from him, who thought it no Usurpation to be equal to God, and keep it when People have it, and tell other folks what it is, is Usurpation; and that who is so bold, as to deny it, stands in danger of being hurried into the Ocean of Controversies, with the Answerers fancy of Scripture, for a sure Compass to direct him out again. All this while we have other Business in hand. We have an Assertion, and an Answer to mind. The Assertion is, That *it were a very irrational thing to make Laws for a Country, and leave it to the Inhabitants to be Interpreters and Judges of those Laws.* And the Answer is, That *it is as irrational to allow an Usurper to Interpret the Laws to his own advantage.* Is this, I, or No, again? or what do's it say? That both are Irrational? which is to say, that the Assertion is true: Or that both are Rational? or one Rational, the other not? Let him say, if he please, what he would be at, and leave Usurpers till we have Business with them.

His Majesty supposes next, that the goodness of God

God would not leave Men uncertain of the way to Heaven, which they would be, if Scripture were the Rule, and every Man his own Judge.

He by way of Queſtion ſays firſt, That *the Rule is capable of being underſtood by thoſe to whom it was given, in order to the great end of it*, Salvation. Which is next to ſaying, that it is not capable of being underſtood, by thoſe to whom it was not given, that is, by any but the Church, to whom alone it was given. In which he may be ſure I ſhall not contradict him. But is it underſtood with certainty, by every Man who will be his own Judge? or are we left to uncertainty? Theſe are our Queſtions, to which, how this which he ſays, ſhould be any ſtep towards an Anſwer, I cannot imagine.

Next he tells us, That *the main end of the Rule was to direct us in the way to Heaven, and not meerly to determine Controverſies.* Here is work enough for him that needs it. For who ſhall underſtand what other end there is of a Rule to determine Controverſies, but determining Controverſies? Heaven is indeed the end for which it is neceſſary Controverſies ſhould be determin'd; but that is to be the end of the Determination, not the Rule. How a Rule made to determine Controverſies ſhould have any end beſides determining them, when the end of a thing is what it was made for; or why directing to Heaven, and determining Controverſies, ſhould here be ſeparated, where the Determination is the very direction of a Rule to determine them, they may Diſpute who love Diſputing. All ſhall paſs for me, till I find ſomething which concerns our Queſtion; *certain* or *uncertain.*

His next words ſuppoſe *Scripture* is the Rule, a

little odly me thinks for an Anſwerer. For when it is objected againſt its being a Rule, that we ſhould be left at uncertainties, it would have ſhew'd better, to have taken ſome notice of the Objection, before he take for granted, the thing which is in Diſpute. But I ſhall not ſtop him. What will he do with his Rule, now he has ſuppos'd it?

Why, *It is fit to examine and compare* Controverſies *with this Infallible Rule*; and then we ſhall determine them Infallibly, I hope. I expected this ſhould follow, but was much miſtaken. What he ſays, is, That *when that is done, to help us in our way to Heaven, is that which it was chiefly intended for.* He may, if he pleaſe, keep his *Intended* till ſome body doubt what was intended in every thing which God do's for Man, and tell us in the mean time, what his examining and comparing will *do.* Whether it will determine Controverſies, or no? and whether certainly, or no? or whether it be no matter whether they be determined or no? but we ſhall get to Heaven by bare *examining*, which ſide ſoever of the Controverſie examined we chuſe, and whether any or none. Whatever was *chiefly* intended, *determining Controverſies* ſure was intended by a Rule to determine them, and our comparing them with that Rule. Pray let him tell us how we ſhall ſucceed, whether hit or miſs, in compaſſing *that* Intention. 'Twill be afterwards time enough to talk of his other *chief* Intention.

He ſays further, That *no Man can think it of equal conſequence to him, not to be miſtaken, and not to be damned.* As if miſtakes in our caſe would not damn a Man. For who can hope to be ſaved without pleaſing God, and every body knows, that without

without Faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe him. But whether do's he mean to lead us? All hitherto ſeems quite out of the way to our Queſtion. For what has the chief end for which a Rule was made, to do with, whether it will guide us certainly, or no? His refuſing to Anſwer, is, in truth, confeſſing that Scripture, after all, is not the Rule of Controverſies. For they are not ended, till one ſide or other be certain. But let us go no farther than we needs muſt.

In Matters of Good and Evil, every Man's Conſcience, he ſays, *is his immediate Judge; and why not in Matters of Truth and Falſhood? Unleſs we ſuppoſe Mens involuntary Miſtakes to be more dangerous, than their wilful Sins.* How! Are we, before we were aware, come to Conſcience at laſt? and all his Magnificent Talk, his Evident, his Sure, and his Infallible, his Care in examining and comparing, for nothing, but to eſtabliſh this Maxim; *Do every one what ſeems good in his own Eyes, and believe what ſeems true?* Is this the *clearer light* he will *give to the things contain'd* in His Majeſty's Papers? and the loſs of ſuch a Liberty, the great danger they run of being *deceiv'd* with their *fair appearance*, whom he will ſecure with his ſafe Inſtructions of truſting their Conſcience, both for Good and for True? Doctrine, or not Doctrine of Chriſt, is no ſuch idle Circumſtance ſure, that hitting or miſſing is equal, ſo the Conſcience be ſtrait, and the Miſtake involuntary. By the way, I ſee not how this *involuntary* can thruſt in here: For, who forces any Body to miſtake? or take the deceitful ways which lead them to it?

But to ſay nothing to that matter, and but little

to his Plea of Conſcience, as copious as the Theme is, I only ask, what Conſcience can do more than ſecure a Man from being judg'd for ſinning againſt his Conſcience? But if it lead him to do ill things, or embrace a wrong Faith, what can he anſwer for the Sin of having that Conſcience? Reaſon certainly never framed ſuch a Conſcience, and there is nothing beſides which could frame it, but Paſſion, that is Affections wrong ſet, or, in plain Engliſh, very wilful Sin. Shall he, who has this to anſwer for, be ſafe, becauſe he has nothing to anſwer for the Sin againſt Conſcience? As if that were the only Sin to be accounted for in the next World.

For the reſt, This, to ſay the truth, is an Anſwer. For Uncertainty do's not prove that Scripture is not the Rule, if it be no matter whether we be uncertain or no; nor indeed, whether there be a Rule, or Faith. For if Conſcience will carry thoſe to Heaven who believe wrong, Faith, I think, may be ſpared, and a Rule for it. But as it is an Anſwer which I believe would not have taken with His late Majeſty, becauſe he had too much Experience of the bad Effects of miſtaken Conſcience, to think it would paſs at the Tribunal of God, more than it did at His, I am confident it will take as little with the Reader. At leaſt I will venture it without more words.

For I mean not to ſtay at a new Apology of his for the Church of *England*, as unſeaſonable as the former, unleſs ſomething were objected to her, and as little obliging. At the rate he talks, one would think She do's, what he undertakes She do's not, *leave every Man to be his own Judge*. For this he makes her do *in what concerns his own Salvation*, that

that is, in all Faith; for Faith concerns Salvation. *Who believes not*, every body, who believes Scripture, knows, *shall be damned.* Then his Seducers, with their dangerous Miſtakes, as ſuch there are, it ſeems, for all his Conſcience-ſecurity; And his *Spiritual Guides* with *their aſſiſtance*, would make work till Doomſday. Nor can Quarrels about them be ended, till thoſe about Faith be ſettled. For till then, who ſhall know which is the Guide, and which the Seducer? As Chriſt appointed no body to teach other Doctrine than he taught, They are plainly no Guides of his appointing who do. The Ancient Creeds too are brought in again, as if they would be ſerviceable to the Church of *England*, and no Liberty of Conſcience allow'd to judge againſt them, or any *Doctrines as univerſally receiv'd*; as if any part of univerſal Chriſtian Doctrine were loſt, and all had not been always as univerſally retain'd as the Creeds. But I have my Anſwer, and will be going.

In the next Section the King asks, *Whether it be not the ſame thing to follow our own Fancy, or to interpret Scripture by it?* And he anſwers, *There might be ſome colour for ſuch a Queſtion*, if They did not do ſo and ſo. Pray what colour has he for ſuch a Reply? Might not the King have colour to ſay what he thought fit to be ſaid, to him to whom he ſpoke, whether there be, or be not colour, to ſay the ſame to the Church of *England*? He writ not to her, nor were His Writings publiſh'd with any relation to her, but to ſatisfie the Curioſity of thoſe who deſir'd to ſee them, and could not come by written Copies, and to aſſure them they were His.

In

In ſtead of concerning her, where ſhe is not concern'd, let him, if he pleaſe, anſwer the Queſtion, and tell us whether it be or be not the ſame, to follow our own Fancy, or interpret Scripture by it. Till he ſay *I*, or *No*, all beſides is leaving the Work cut out for us, to cut out new of our own, which twenty to one we ſhall never make up. For which Reaſon I will pray him to keep his many Queſtions, till the Diſpute be between the two Churches, and I appear for the Church of *Rome*. Till then, he cannot rationally expect an Anſwer from me. He perhaps may be able to manage two Diſputes at a time, or think the beſt way to end one is to begin another; I think it too much for me to defend a King and a Church at once. And ſo, much good may his pleaſant Fancies do him, about *a Rule and its Interpretation*, which he talks as if he would have belong to thoſe who do not know the Senſe of it; about the *Intention of Almighty God*, as if we knew not what he intended, and did make the Pillar and Ground of Truth; about *reforming Diſorders*, which he makes unreformable, even in Commonwealths, where the Supreme Judge has the ill luck to be principally accus'd; about *Oaths*, as if any were taken to defend an unjuſt Authority, or could bind, tho' they were; about a *Judge of Tradition*, as if a Man who ſees Pictures in one Church, and none in another, needed a Judge to pronounce to him, that thoſe Churches practiſe differently. His *Uſurpers*, and all, ſhall do what he would have them for me. I wiſh, in ſtead of all this, he would have minded his Buſineſs, but mean however to mind mine.

What he replies to the next Section, ſhews more like

like an Answer, than any thing said yet. *I would have any Man shew me*, says the King, *where the Power of deciding Matters of Faith is given to every particular Man.* He distinguishes, and says, The Power of Deciding so as to oblige others, is not given to every particular Man; the Power of Deciding so as to satisfie the particular Decider, is. Denial is a fair Answer; and this seems to deny what His Majesty says, and yet in truth says nothing to it. *Deciding* of particular Men; being *our own Judges*; following our *own Fancy*, or *private Spirit*; believing *as we please*, and the like Expressions, signifie all the same. And the King, as Men use to do, who mind Sense more than Words, and have Language at will, takes now one, now another, as they come in His way. As it could not scape an Eye less piercing than His, that he judges every jot as much who believes upon the Authority of the Church, as he who believes upon his own Fancy of Scripture; and that every Assent is a Judgment, and so the Assent of Faith, as well as the rest: it cannot be imagin'd that He would have Men not judge at all. But He meant, as all the World means by those Phrases, that they should not judge unreasonably. For as they are blamed, who will be their own Judges; and no body blames another for doing well; and Judging is of it self a good thing, an Exercise of a Faculty planted in us by God; there is nothing to be blamed, but the ill use of that Faculty, by suffering Passion to sway it, which should only be guided by Reason. That Men do mean thus by those Expressions, we see by the Cases to which they apply them. He who being biass'd by Interest, or Conceit of himself, will needs have things go as his Bias draws,

draws, against the Advice of his unpassionate and wiser Friends; or he, who has no skill in Physic or Law, and yet will commence and prosecute Suits, or prescribe Physic, against the Advice of able Lawyers and Doctors, is said to be his own Judge: He is not, who understanding Jewels, or Pictures, buys them at his own Rate, tho' never so many, of less insight than himself, persuade him to the contrary; but Reason is said to be his Judge. Now the King thought, because Christ taught his Apostles and Disciples, who, with those that believ'd his Doctrine upon their Preaching, and their Successors through all Ages are called the Church, that he could not proceed reasonably, who would pretend to find out that Doctrine by his own Wit, or Study, or any way, but by learning it of the Church, which receiv'd it at first from Christ, and preserv'd it ever since. And this unreasonable Judgment, made on their own Heads or Fancy, against the Judgment of those whose Profession it is, His several Expressions strike at. The Answerer reflected not on the meaning of them, but would persuade us, That to say particular Men must be satisfied of the Reasons why they believe, is an Answer to the Question, Whether there be indeed any Reasons why they should believe, besides the Authority of the Church?

To go forward, *Christ*, says his Majesty, *left his Power to his Church, even to forgive Sins in Heaven, and left his Spirit with them, which they exercised after his Resurrection.* He answers, as if he were at cross purposes, *where then was the* Roman *Catholic Church?* What has *where was she?* to do with *what was left to her?* 'Tis a strange Question besides, and he, I believe, the first, who ever ask'd,

where

where a Church was, before she was. The *Roman* was a part of the Catholic, as soon as she was a Church; till then she was where all the Churches of the World besides were, except that of *Hierusalem*, and where the Church of *Hierusalem* too was, before *Christ* was born, in the order of Providence. But *how can it be hence inferr'd, that these Powers are now in the Church of* Rome (*Roman* Catholic Church, I suppose, he means) *exclusive to all others, unless it be made appear that it was Heir-General to all the Apostles?* As if there needed Logic to infer, that Powers left for the Salvation of Mankind, remain in being as long as there remains a Mankind to be saved; or Powers left to the Church of *Christ*, are in the Church of *Christ*; and those excluded from the Powers, who are not included in the Church; or to make appear She is Heir-General to all the Apostles, who as visibly as that the Scripture is in Print, is the One Church of *Christ*. Possibly he could be content to be discoursing of this Point: but since his Majesty thought it not to his purpose to do more than barely mention it; I think it not to mine, to stray from the Papers I defend.

In the process of his Discourse, he would remove the ordinary Power of the Keys out of the Dispute; and shall with all my heart, so he remove it not out of the Church. For since it was, with the rest, given only to her, I do not see what other good Title there can be to it, but that of being Part of Her. He is, by his good favour, over-hasty in removing Miraculous Power out of the Church. For God, who slights not the *Roman* Catholic Church so much as he, continues still to work Miracles in her. And would he be content to put the whole

Iſſue on Miracles, I would be content to undertake the Proof. But alas! I fear there needs a Miracle to make People willing that Differences of Religion ſhould have any Iſſue.

He would have it queſtion'd, *What part of the Promiſe of the Infallible Spirit was to expire with the Apoſtles; what to be continued to the Church in all Ages?* And *how far that* Promiſe *extends*? Strange Queſtions for Chriſtians to diſpute, after they have been anſwer'd by Chriſt himſelf. When Chriſt has extended the Aſſiſtance of that Spirit to *All* his Doctrine, and *All* Time; for us to ask which part of that Aſſiſtance ſhall ceaſe? or to what? is to ask, Which is the Part of Chriſt's Promiſe which he will not perform? Neither indeed are theſe Queſtions, with his Diſtinction between Sin and Errour, and ſubtle Speculations upon it, for any thing, but to bring in Depoſing Doctrine, a Common-place bang'd in every Book of late.

It is a Theme, than which, as much as it is declam'd upon, I do not think a worſe can be taken for an Invective againſt Infallible Aſſiſtance, pick and chuſe through the whole Bundle. When I conſider what has paſt, and reflect there wanted neither Power nor Propenſion in Men, and nevertheleſs that the Perſuaſions about Depoſing were never ſettled, as thoſe in other Matters which diſpleaſe the Anſwerer, what he takes for an Argument againſt Infallible Aſſiſtance, I take for a ſtrong Argument for it. For what elſe could be the Cauſe of that Effect, but that the Power even of willing Men was directed by an over-ruling Aſſiſtance of the Divine Spirit? He may make what ſhew he pleaſes, with the Errours of Church-Guides, who will not reflect they never exercis'd

ercis'd the Power of Church-Guides upon those Errours, or, in his Language, *so as to oblige others*; which yet he knows very well no Council, of those he had in his eye, ever did. As the Church to whom the Promise of Assistance was made, should best know what it means, none in the *Roman* Catholic Church ever understood it would always preserve, even those who by their Functions are Church-Guides, from Errour any more than Sin, save when they perform the Office of Church-Guides; or expected more, than that They should not Authoritatively declare that to be Christ's Doctrine, which is not; or that not to be, which is. Since it is undeniably certain, that our Church-Guides have never made any such Declaration, in stead of profiting by their Pains, we stand wondring what Protestants mean, by repeating so often a Tale which has nothing in it. Whoever errs among us, Church-Guide, or not Church-Guide, errs on his own Head, and not misguided now, or at any time, by the Church or her Gnides. And so long it is as wildly unreasonable to impute those Errours to the Church, or any but the erring Particulars, as to bring *Peter* in guilty for the Faults of *Paul*.

And this is the descant he makes upon, *Christ left his Power*, and Spirit to the Church, which they exercised: *First*, *by his Apostles*, go's on the King, *to these Creeds* their Creed, I suppose it should be, but the Copist, or Compositor mistook *and many Years after by the Council of* Nice, *where that Creed was made that is called by that Name*, &c. This latter part the Answerer *passes over*, *the Sense*, he says, *being imperfect*, *and what is material about the Creeds*, *spoken to already*. And the Sense indeed is

imperfect, as half-periods uſe to be: but who read the whole, will, I believe, underſtand it perfectly enough, and if he had no mind to ſpeak to this part of it, he might have ſaid ſo, without imputing to it an Imperfection of his own making, by ſevering it from its fellows. As imperfect as it is, I find by it, that the Power, of which his Majeſty ſpeaks, was the Power of deciding Matters of Faith; and ſo, that when he talks of the Gift of Tongues, and the like, he talks of what his Majeſty did not. It informs us too, that, as great Prerogatives as the Apoſtles had above other Men, ſubſequent Councils took upon them to make Creeds as well as they; Creeds which declare they will undoubtedly periſh eternally, who believe not entirely what they contain: And ſo might have put us in mind, that thoſe who do as much in latter Ages, have Precedents for what They do: Matters, which it ſeems, he takes no delight to ſpeak of.

As it had been ſomething rugged to have ſaid this Part, for all it was left out, deſerv'd no conſideration, he ſmoothly paſſes to *that which next do's*. And that is, *That the Church was the Judge even of Scripture it ſelf, many Years after the Apoſtles, which Books were Canonical, and which were not.* To which he replys, That there is *a Judge of Law, and a Judge of Fact*, and that *the Church Judges of Fact, not Law.* Let him call it how he pleaſes, if the Church judges whether a Book be Canonical or no, the Church is the Judge of that Matter, and the King ſaid true; and 'tis but ſo much erudition loſt, to Diſpute by what name Her Judgment ſhall go. He ſays beſides that, "*The Church of* Rome *hath no particular priviledge in this Matter, but gives its Judg-*

ment

ment as other parts of the Christian World do. As if the Clause he answers, spoke of any particular Church, or Priviledge. It says, *the Church*, that is, the *whole*, made up of the *Roman*, and the rest, whose same Faith intitles them to the same Appellation, was the Judge of Scripture, which Books were Canonical, and which were not. One may perceive the Answerer thinks this is true, and he might have said, what he thought, in two words. But he thought fit to spin it out into a Section, and divide the Matter so, that one Member of his Division is not included in the Matter divided; he alone knows, why.

And if They had this Power then, I desire to know, says his Majesty next, *how They came to lose it?* And the Answerer desires to know *who are meant by* They, *and what is understood by* This Power. He had not the Paper by him sure, when he askt these Questions. For it is there as plain, as words can make it, that by *They* is meant *the Church*, and by *this Power*, the *Power of deciding Matters of Faith*, exercised in making Creeds, and judging of Canonical Books. Then he falls to his Distinctions again, and tells us, *It is one thing for a part of the Church to give Testimony to a matter of Fact, and another to assume the Power of making Books* Canonical, *which were not so.* Pieces of Learning, which he may, if he please, keep in reserve till he have to do with some body, who talks of a *Part of the Church*, or *making Books* Canonical *which were not.* By the way, he means, I suppose, making Books not written by Divine Inspiration, to be written by Divine Inspiration. For if he mean making it appear, and that Authoritatively, and with obligation of submission, that a Book, of which it is doubted whether it were so written

whether or no, was writ by Divine Inſpiration, ſo, the King, he ſays, makes account, the Judgment of the Church does make a Book Canonical. In the mean time, How the Church came to loſe the Power of Judging Matters of Faith? is the Queſtion: To which the Answerer means, it ſeems, to take time to answer.

His Majeſty deſires to know farther, *By what Authority We ſeparate themſelves from that Church?* *What Church?* ſays the Anſwerer, *The Catholic and Apoſtolic?* Yes, That is the Church of which his Majeſty ſpeaks. *We*, replies the Anſwerer, *own no Separation from that.* Thoſe *We* of his, are they Men who ſeparate from that Church or no? If they are not, the Paragraph ſpeaks not to them; If they are, it expects they ſhould ſhew by what Authority they ſeparate. Not to *own* their Separation, is a bad Authority, and a worſe excuſe, and as much as to ſay, They do what they are aſham'd to own. *But we are diſown'd from the Communion of the* Roman *Church, that we may keep up the ſtricter Union with the truly Catholic and Apoſtolic Church*, That is to ſay, The *Hand* is ſever'd from the *Arm* to cloſe the firmer with the *Body*. But let that paſs. Here is *We*, and the Means by which he would, I ſuppoſe, draw in the Church of *England* again. As I cannot believe he has Commiſſion from her, to ſay, ſhe is diſſented in Faith, as we take it here) from the Communion even of the *Roman* Church, I underſtand him to ſpeak only for himſelf, and thoſe who are of his Mind for theſe, if he perſiſt to think that Separation from the *Roman*, no Separation from the truly Catholic, and Apoſtolic Church, I grant it, becauſe I believe his Majeſty would, he ſhew

that

that truly Catholic and Apostolic Church, with which, by separting from the *Roman*, they keep up their stricter Union, and with which the *Roman* has none. For sure he do's not talk of a strict Union with nothing. Let him tell us in what Countries the Men live, that People may go to them, and learn of them what their Faith is, and see whether it will be all one with that of the Answerer and his Friends, and have something, more than his word, for the stricter Union, which he says, is between them.

What He, and those who take his part, do, is no *separating of themselves*, he tells us, *but being cast out by an Usurping Faction in the Church*; and that the Conditions of Communion *impos'd by that Faction*, and requir'd by him who is own'd for Head of that Church, *are unjust and unreasonable, and the Authority he challenges a meer Usurpation*; and that *They are not to be condemn'd for such a Separation, which was unavoidable*. Why unavoidable, I beseech him, even supposing Usurpation, and whatever he would have? Cannot they who are, let it be never so unjustly, separated from the Communion, avoid being separated from the Faith of a Church, if they please? Is there any Church, or Power on Earth, which could hinder them from believing, when they were out of Communion, what they did when they were in it? Which if they had done, Excommunication it self had not separated them from the Church, of which these Papers speak. For all are included in it who have one Faith with her. But if they would needs have another Faith, They separated themselves I think; for I know no body else that could this way separate them. Alas! the only thing which casts them out of this Church, who are

our,

out, is their voluntary Change of Faith. And that Change indeed casts them unavoidably out; because to be of the same Faith with a Church, and of a different Faith from her, is inconsistent. Other casting out, by which he means, I suppose, Excommunication, there is none that I know. 'Tis true, there is a general Excommunication of those who have chang'd their Faith into Heresie: And some are particularly named; but not a word of the Church of *England*, or any relating to *England*, but the *Wicklifists*. If any of his *We* be included in it, 'tis because they have voluntarily thrust themselves in, by embracing the Anathematiz'd Heresies. And yet he, with his Flourishes and big Talk, would have their casting off the Church, pass for the Churches casting them out; and their voluntary Act be call'd, a being cast unavoidably out. Cross Language, in my Opinion, and a very sorry Justification of Separation.

But what has he in reserve (I see what he alledges) to justifie his confident Reproach of *Usurpation*? The Sacred Head of the Church, on whom he cries out for an Usurper, has shew'd, by his reiterated Approbation of the Bishop of *Meaux* Book, that he is content with that Submission and Obedience which the *Holy Councils and Fathers have always taught the Faithful*. Pray with what propriety of Language, or what Sense, do's he call challenging of so much, Usurpation? What Scripture, or Ancient Church, or Part of the Christian World, consents with him that 'tis so? not excepting the Church of *England* her self. For there is more reason to take the Expositor's word, who speaks in her Name, than his, for the Sense of the Church of *England*.

England. And from him I learn, it ſticks not at this Point, ſince ſhe *will be content to yield the Pope that Authority which the Ancient Councils of the Primitive Church have acknowledged, and the Holy Fathers have always taught the Faithful to give him.* And She, I ſuppoſe, would not yield to an Uſurpation, nor the Expoſitor for her.

But pray for what is this Harangue upon Uſurpation, and a Spiritual Kingdom? The King would know, how People come to ſeparate from the Church, that is, vary from the Common Faith of Chriſtians? And the Anſwerer tells him, There is an Uſurper ſet up in the Weſt. Why, ſuppoſe there be, muſt People therefore needs believe otherwiſe than they did before? needs believe there is no Change of Subſtance, no Purgatory, no more than two Sacraments, and the reſt? This Weſtern Uſurpation has no Influence upon the Eaſt, to make the Chriſtians there change their Faith. Why cannot the Reformation believe of theſe Points as they believe, and as all Chriſtians, beſides themſelves, ever have, and ſtill do? So all Differences would be reduc'd to a ſingle Point, and that, if we may believe the Expoſitor, either no Difference, or eaſily reconcileable. But to go about to make us believe, we muſt needs differ about a hundred things, and can by no means think it lawful to pray to a Saint, or ſet up an Image, as long as a certain Man takes more than comes to his ſhare, ſhews the Anſwerer was either in a very pleaſant Humour, or hard put to it for ſomething to ſay.

I have follow'd him, till I am got quite out of my way. To return again. By what Authority do Men ſeparate from the Catholic and Apoſtolic

Church? ſays the Queſtion. We own no Separation from that, but are disjoyn'd from the *Roman*, ſays the Anſwerer. Since that Church is nothing but the *Roman*, and the reſt united in the ſame Faith, as a Man's Body is nothing but the ſeveral Members animated by the ſame Soul; and no Part can be cut off from any of the Members, no Part of a Finger, for example, from the Finger, without being cut off from the whole Body: This is in truth to ſay, We are not ſeparated, we are only disjoyned; or, We are not ſeparated, but ſeparated. But to let this paſs, and not ſtray further after him into the many Queſtions which his Reply would ſtart; As, Whether there be any Catholic, beſides the *Roman* Catholic Church? Whether there can be Reaſon for being disjoyn'd from any Part of it? Whether Diſjoyning, and Union, be not flat Contradiction? ſince Disjoyning ſignifies a different Faith, and Union the ſame? And the like, in which, whatever concern his *We* have, I do not believe he has Authority from the Church of *England* to concern her. All theſe things apart, I obſerve the Anſwerer do's here as elſewhere, appears himſelf, and leaves his Anſwer behind. For who they are that ſeparate, and what they own, and from what part they profeſs to be diſ-joyn'd, is nothing to what Authority they have to ſeparate from the whole, who do? The Kings Queſtion is a ſtep to an end of Controverſies: For let People once know, that they, whoever they be, are in a deplorable condition, who live ſeparated from the one Church of *Chriſt* upon Earth, thoſe among them, who have any care of their Souls, will bethink themſelves, and be glad to find her out, and by piecing with her, if they be broken

off,

off, help to make that One, the only Church on Earth, and all Christians of a mind again. And I wish the Answerer had gone that one step without staggering. It had been a safe step for every body, who is sure he do's not separate. For it takes off no weight from any Reason, by which he can shew that he do's not. But I am afraid, the youngest Man in Christendom shall never live to see one step made towards an end of differences in Religion; at least, if the Answerer were inclin'd that way, he might, me thinks, without boggling, have frankly own'd there is, or there is not Authority to separate.

The last Paragraph asks, when pretences are made of separating from the Church, *Who shall judge of them? the whole Church, or particular Men?* He answers, That *the whole force of this Paragraph depends upon a Supposition, which is taken for granted, but will never be yielded by Them, and they are sure can never be prov'd by the Church of* Rome. Let the Paragraph and its force, depend on what it will, could he not have answered a plain Question plainly, and told us whether the Judgment of pretences do, or do not belong to the Church, and if not, to whom else? He pretends here, that things are taken for granted on one side, which can never be prov'd, and will never be yielded by the other. Let him tell us if he please, before he proceed, who shall judge of thus much? Who pronounce whether those of the Church of *Rome* can prove or no, and before whom they shall, when it comes to their turn, produce their proofs? Who likewise, whether the other side *ought* to yield? For whether they *will* or no depends on none but that Judge, *Who has in his Hands the Souls of all* [illegible] *that live.*

The Supposition made by the Paragraph, is, he says, *That in the new imposed Articles, the whole Church in a continued Succession hath been of the same Judgment with them, and only some* few particular Men, *in these last Ages have opposed them. Whereas the great thing they insist upon, next to the Holy Scripture, is, that we can never prove the points in difference by an universal Tradition from the Apostles time.* As if the consent of the whole Church were not it self a proof. But let that pass. The things which he makes the Paragraph suppose, are the very pretences of which it expresly speaks, *New Articles*, and *wrested Scripture*. He himself pretends them for one side: The other pretends there is no such matter. And His Majesty asks who shall judge of these contrary pretences? Cannot he afford to answer a King directly, but must needs harrangue upon pretences, about which no body do's, nor need ask him: for they are known well enough. *We*, says the Answerer farther, *do not take upon our selves to contradict the universal Sense of the Christian Church from the Apostles time in any one Point.* As if any body were to learn that They pretend this too. Whatever They take upon them, some body sure is to judge, whether they contradict the universal Sense of the Church or no. The King would fain come acquainted with this some body, and the Answerer to satisfy him, who this Judge is, tells him whatas to be judg'd by him, when he sits. Why, if he be resolved not to answer the Question, it had been but saying so, and there had been an end, and our Chap saved.

Then he tells us a story of proceedings in *England*, [illegible] of them, in the change of Religion.

Alas!

Alas! a favourable imagination cost's no more than a pleasing Dream, and less Wit, than the Answerer has, will serve a Man, who has the making of his own Tale, to make a fair one. History do's not *speak*, nor every body who reads it, *think* as he do's. One of his three Answers might have been spared if they did. But we have nothing to do with his account at present. It may be true, or false for any Relation it has to our Inquiry. For we shall not find the Judge we look for, ever a jot the sooner by knowing how the differences to be judg'd came about, than by knowing what they were. And I care not to talk of things which are not to our purpose.

All the use he makes of his Narrative is to conclude at last, that the Articles of Religion drawn up in *England*, *are the Sense of their Church, and not the Opinions or Fancies of particular Men.* And what then? Why then His Majesty, I suppose he will say, forgot himself, when he talk'd of particular Men. As if particular Churches were not particular Men in his Question. *Particular* is oppos'd to *General*, and what he understood by *General*: was *the whole Church, the Succession whereof has continued to this day without interruption*. And so whoever belong not to that General Body, few or many enough to bear the Name of a Church, or not, are all, in his Language, particular Men. But this is no more to our purpose than the rest. Our Inquiry pinches not on Particular, or not Particular. For 'tis not ask'd whether They be Churches or single Men, who differ from the Church of *Rome*? but by whom differences shall be judg'd.

Notwithstanding, this may be an Answer, if he will have every particular Church judge for it self. And this I am afraid he would be at. For I see for

why

why he drives all to the Judgment of a particular Church, unleſs he think all ſafe there, and the Judgment of that Church not to be ſubmitted to any farther Judgment. Which if he do, he plainly thinks there is no Judge between Churches whatever may be, betwixt Churches and particular Men. This indeed is a full Anſwer, and which takes the Queſtion quite away. For it can no longer be ask'd, who is the Judge, if there be none at all. But he do's not explain himſelf, and 'tis not for me to make him ſay more than he do's. This I ſee; that either this is his Anſwer, or he gives none. For there is nothing beſides, but what pretences they make, and who made them, and upon what account. All which is nothing to, *who is the Judge of them?*

His Uſurper is a ſtrange importunate fellow to thruſt in ſo often, where he has nothing to do, and I have no more to ſay to him. At the laſt conſideration I am as much ſurpriz'd as the Anſwerer. For I thought no Intereſt ſhould have been remembred in our Caſe, but One, *what it avails a Man to gain the whole World and loſe his Soul.* I ſee no great cauſe he has to wonder, that Princes and the Clergy ſhould be of different minds in Matters of Religion. He knows the Caſe has happened heretofore, and that there had been no change of Religion in *England*, if the whole Body of the Clergy, and their Advice had been regarded. But not to pry into Mens Hearts, to ſee what Intereſt ſways them, This is certain, that thoſe Princes, who prefer their Eternal, before their Temporal Intereſt, when they are for the Church of *Rome*, give good example; And I cannot conclude better, than with praying God to give every body the Grace to follow it; and in behalf of Princes, thanking him for minding his Reader, that they are not all drawn to the Church of *Rome* by Intereſt.

A

A DEFENCE OF THE Second Paper.

THE first Paragraph, as the Answerer has handled it, concerns the Church of *England* more than me. If She, when the King talks of Heresies, and Heresies crept in, think her self oblig'd by the Answerers thinking presently of her: or when she is brought in, by his turning immediately to justifie the Dissenters, and that by an Argument alledged formerly in her behalf, with something more favour to them too than her; for he allows Them Six Councils, and but Four to Her. I have nothing to do with it. They are Matters between themselves. Are there Heresies in *England*, or are there not? Is it a sad thing there should, or is it not? These are the Questions at present; and 'twill be time enough to talk of the Church of *England* and Dissenters, when they are answered. What Power the Church of *Rome* has *to define Heretical Doctrines*, will keep cold too. For 'tis not ask'd, How Heresies come to be, or are known to be Here-

sies

ness but, Whether there be, or be not Hereſies among us? In a word; One thing is *ſad*, ſays the King; another thing is *hateful*, ſays the Anſwerer. And this is the Subſtance of the Paragraph. The H[illegible] himſelf not anſwering, it ſeems was not ſpent, and he had a mind to keep up the Frolic.

His Majeſty ſays next, That *every Man thinks himſelf as competent a Judge of Scripture as the very Apoſtles themſelves*. The main of his Anſwer is, That none do pretend to the Infallible Spirit which they had. For the reſt, he repeats again, That every Man muſt be a Judge in reſpect of himſelf, not of others. And ſays, they own the Authority of Guides in the Church, and a due Submiſſion to them, but *do not allow them to be as competent Judges of Scripture as the Apoſtles themſelves*.

That he ſhould lay the ſtreſs of his Anſwer on a Cabble This Expreſſion, *as competent as the Apoſtles*, is but an ordinary way of ſaying very competent. As when we ſay, *This* Man is as ſtrong as *Samſon*, *That* as wiſe as *Solomon*; we mean no more than that they are very ſtrong and wiſe. And he can think, that Not juſt ſo competent as the Apoſtles, is an Anſwer to, Whether Competent or no? and to catch at a Word, fit Matter in a Diſpute with a King. But let us ſee. The Apoſtles, for what concerned themſelves, could do no more with their Infallible Spirit, than judge for themſelves, and act in order to their Salvation according to that Judgment. And ſo much the Anſwerer contends is the right of every Body. Why then, every body is in rigour as competent a Judge for himſelf, as the Apoſtles. And he pretends to deny what His Majeſty affirmed, by affirming more himſelf: For His Majeſty only ſaid,

that

that every Man *thought himself*; and he affirms, that every Man *is* and *must be* Judge for himself. Which where every body is, pray what others are there, or can there be, for whom any body, even the Apostles themselves, if they were alive, can judge? There is nothing for them to exercise their infallible Spirit upon, but the Multitude which remains, after every single Man is gone. Alas! that there should be such trifling in the Concerns of Salvation. His Majesty was not solicitous to whom Judgment of Religion extends, nor says a word of that matter; but on what grounds it is made: And griev'd to see People so careless of their Souls, as to venture them upon a Judgment which they find by experience deceives them forty times a day; so, as no Gamester would venture a Bet, against infinite Odds. The Answerer minds nothing of this; but provided People will be content to think themselves not full out so wise as the Apostles, takes pains to persuade them, they are wise enough for a Matter of no greater import than Eternity. And never troubling their Heads with the impertinent Thought, of dealing securely so much as for themselves, encouriges them to swim without skill; so they drown, every one for himself, without pulling in his Neighbour, all is well enough.

What he means by the Authority of Guides in the Church, when he leaves not a single Judgment to exercise their Authority upon; and what by due Submission, except perhaps such a Submission as we give to those who are stronger than ourselves, and may make us uneasie if we displease them, he who makes all that concerns Salvation submitted to nothing but the Judgment of particular Men? I not-

ther underſtand, nor mean to inquire. It concerns thoſe Guides, and it is not for me to thruſt my ſelf into the Concerns of other Folks.

And 'tis no wonder, ſays the third Paragraph, *it ſhould be ſo, ſince that Part of the Nation, which looks moſt like a Church, dares not bring the true Arguments againſt the other Sects, for fear they ſhould be turned againſt themſelves, and confuted by their own Arguments.* To this he ſays firſt, That *it is directly level'd againſt the Church of England.* As if an Arrow were the ſharper, or blunter, for the Mark at which it is aim'd. Let him tell us whether the Aſſertion be true, or not true, and talk of Levelling, when Levelling is in queſtion. He is out even in that too. For the Paragraph is in truth level'd, not againſt the Church of *England*, but her Misfortune. It is an Expreſſion of Compaſſion, not Reproach, that ſhe has been overaw'd from uſing the true Arguments againſt Sectaries.

Then he anſwers, That *if there can be no Authority in a Church, without Infallibility; or no Obligation to ſubmit to Authority, without it; then the Church of* England *doth not uſe the beſt Arguments againſt Sectaries. But if there be no ground for Infallibility*, as if his own Goodneſs were not Ground enough for God to give it to a Nature which needs it, and his Word not Ground enough to believe he has given it; *then, for ought he can ſee, the Church of* England *hath wiſely diſown'd the Pretence of Infallibility, and made uſe of the beſt Arguments againſt Sectaries, from a juſt Authority, and the Sinfulneſs and Folly of the Sectaries refuſing to ſubmit to it.*

I take for granted, he ſpeaks of Authority to guide Souls to Heaven, ſuch as was in the Primitive Church,

Church, when the Civil Laws were all againſt her. And pray him, if he pleaſe, to inſtruct us how ſuch Authority can be in a Church, without Infallibility. We ſee no body will believe a Man, who, after he has told his Story, ſhould add, It may be all falſe, for any thing he knows; nor lend his Money upon a Promiſe to be repaid, which the Borrower declares before-hand he knows not whether he can keep or no. And we are perſuaded there ſhould be better Security for our Souls, than for our Money, or unconcerning Opinions. To ſay a Church is fallible, is to ſay ſhe may be deceiv'd; and if ſhe may be deceiv'd her ſelf, They may be deceiv'd who follow her. Wherefore to tell us, that ſuch a Church has notwithſtanding Authority to guide us, and that we ought ſubmit to it, is to tell us, we ought be led by a Guide, who cannot anſwer he knows the way we ſhould go, and venture eternal Happineſs or Miſery on a Security, which he who gives, tells us plainly before-hand may fail us.

Pray let us conſider. Chriſtians, every body knows, are oblig'd to loſe all things; their Goods, their Liberty, their Lives, rather than their Faith. Can it be reaſonable to do this for a Faith, of which they are conſcious to themſelves, that it may be falſe, for any thing they know? And do's not his own Heart tell him, who knows nothing of it but by the Relation of a fallible Relator, that it may be falſe, for ought he can tell? Wherefore, to make the Faith of Chriſtians depend on a fallible Authority, is to make Chriſtianity, with its obliging Duties, the moſt unreaſonable thing in Nature.

What do I ſay, *unreaſonable*? It is to make it abſolutely impoſſible. For, can I be a Chriſtian

without believing? Is not Belief a judgment that the thing is true which I believe? Can I have such a Judgment without a cauſe able to produce it? And is a fallible Authority able to make me judge more than that the thing is *fallibly* true? When Chriſtianity therefore obliges me to believe the thing *abſolutely* true, if there be nothing to make me believe but a fallible Authority, it obliges me to an Effect without a Cauſe, that is, to a downright impoſſibility. And indeed to flat Contradiction. For as a thing cannot poſſibly be true, and not true at once, to judge it is true, is to judge it cannot at the ſame time be falſe. But I muſt of neceſſity judge both, if I judge upon a Motive which I know is fallible: *That it is true* by the Judgment to which Chriſtianity obliges me; and *that it may be falſe*, by the ſame Judgments being grounded on my fallible Authority. For by judging it fallible, I judge it may deceive me, that is, that what it recommends to me for true, may be falſe. At which rate he is the only good Chriſtian who contradicts himſelf.

When the Anſwerer ſhall make out, that ſuch things can be, we may hope to ſee his Church Authority without Infallibility. Till then he will permit us to be perſuaded that Infallibility is the true Argument, which he confeſſes has not been us'd againſt Sectaries.

If it be true, that the Church of *England* cannot pretend to this Argument, which *if ſhe did, Sectaries*, he ſays, *might juſtly turn it againſt her*, it is ſo much the worſe, and the Kings Diſcourſe is indeed levelled againſt her. But I ſee no ſuch matter. Why may not ſhe, if ſhe pleaſe, pretend to her ſhare in the Infallibility of the Whole, by remaining, as I think,

think, her beſt Advocates plead ſhe do's, a part of the Whole? Becauſe, ſays he, *tho' Church Authority be aſſerted, Infallibility is deny'd in her Articles.* Where I beſeech him? for I cannot find Infallibility deny'd, ſave to particular Churches, whereof any one undoubtedly may forfeit her pretence to Infallibility, by changing her former Faith, and ſo ceaſing to be a Member of the Body, to which it was promiſed. But this is her concern not mine. If it be ſo with her, ſhe may thank thoſe againſt whom the Kings Diſcourſe is truly levell'd; thoſe who have pull'd this Argument out of her Hands, and reduc'd her to have nothing to urge againſt Sectaries, but the ſinfulneſs and folly of their Separation: as if ſhe could take it ill of other folks that they ſeparate from her, if ſhe be brought to ſeparate from other folks: Or, as if there were any ſin, or folly in Peoples deſiring to make their Salvation ſure, and when they cannot find ſecurity in a Fallible Authority, ſeeking it elſewhere.

There follows that *the Church of* England, *as 'tis call'd.* This *as 'tis call'd* makes him teachy; and he *would fain know what ſhe wants to make her as good a Church as any in the Chriſtian World*; ſhe that wants neither *Faith, if the Creed contain it,* nor *Sacraments,* nor *Succeſſion of Biſhops,* nor a *Liturgy.* Never ſo little Indulgence for a King, would have ſuffered him to ſpeak as he thought fit, eſpecially when he had apply'd the Word, which offends the Anſwerer, to the Church of *Rome* too. For he ſaid of the *Roman,* the Church which is *call'd* the *Roman Catholic.* But if the Anſwerers Zeal for the Church of *England* be ſo very nice, it might have been employ'd much more *according to knowledge,* in ſaying ſome-

ſomething material for her, than in picking a needleſs Quarrel.

If the *Church of* England *really be not what ſhe is call'd*, it is long of her ſelf, and the influence ſhe ſuffers thoſe to have, who will needs poſſeſs the World, that ſhe ſets up Separately for her ſelf with a different Faith, from that of the great Body. As the Whole is but One Church, made up of as many Members, as there are particular Churches which profeſs the ſame Faith; it is unintelligible how there can be a particular Church otherwiſe, than by being a Member of this Body. If the Anſwerer have a mind to ſhew ſhe is a Church, he ſhould ſhew ſhe is a Member, and believes as the reſt, not alledge for her things common to as very Heretics as ever were in the World. For how many of them receiv'd the Creed, had Sacraments, Succeſſion of Biſhops, and Liturgies? Not to touch the reſt (in which, for all the Anſwerers confidence, there are difficulties more than he or any Man will be able to clear.) Is it not palpable that Chriſtians are as much oblig'd to believe every thing which *Chriſt* taught, when 'tis known he taught it, as what is contain'd in the Creed? And is it not as certainly known he taught much more, as that he taught what is there contain'd? Is it not palpable, that ſhe her ſelf believes more? I for my part, underſtand not the Zeal of talking, as if ſhe quitted her only ſure hold, to ſtand upon Ground which will certainly founder under her, and upon which arrant Heretics are forc'd to ſtand, becauſe they have no better. But this again is her concern. Our buſineſs is with the remaining part of the Paragraph, which ſays, that ſhe *would have it thought, that ſhe is the Judge in matters Spiritual, yet dares not ſay poſitively, there is no appeal from her.* His

His Anſwer, dilated with ſeveral Examples, is, That They are true Judges, from whom there lies an Appeal. Still catching at Words, and ſaying nothing to the Thing! His Majeſty was ſolicitous of freeing the Nation from the Hereſies crept in, and convincing the Sects by Arguments, to which there could be no return. Till the Church of *England* can determine Spiritual, as a Judge do's Temporal Differences, by a final Sentence, concluſive to the Parties, He thought ſo great a Benefit could not be expected from her. The Anſwerer, with his Zeal, never thinks of ſhewing which way ſhe can conclude any body, but, as if the Name of a thing were All, tells us, There are true Judges, who nevertheleſs cannot conclude the Parties which come before them. Why, His Majeſty, and every body elſe, knew this, without needing to trouble his Rhetoric and Erudition for the Matter. But what are thoſe Judges to our purpoſe? What Benefit ſhall we get by them? And how much the nearer will our Differences be to an end? If there were no other in the World, Suits would be endleſs in a Nation, and Controverſies in a Church; as I pray God there be not who deſire no better. In ſhort, His Majeſty talks of Judges, from whom there lies no Appeal; He, of Judges from whom there do's; and gives us this for a ſatisfactory Anſwer.

He might peradventure have made ſomething a better ſhew, by ſaying, That His Majeſty, by expecting the Church of *England* ſhould judge without Appeal, expects more than can be had from a particular Church; becauſe Appeals muſt needs lie from all ſuch. But every particular Church may judge as the reſt of the Body do; and it is to our purpoſe all one, to judge

judge without Appeal and to judge as they judge from whom there is none. For that Judgment is without Appeal, tho' not purely in vertue of the Authority of the particular Church. So the Church of *England* may judge without Appeal; and if she do not, may thank those who will not let her.

His Majesty goes on, proving what he had said: *For either They must say, that They are Infallible, (which they cannot pretend to*, that is, otherwise than by giving the right-hand of Fellowship to those who are *or confess, that what they decide in Matters of Conscience, is no farther to be followed, than it agrees with every Mans private Judgment. If Christ did leave a Church here upon Earth, and We were all once of that Church, How, and by what Authority, did we separate from that Church? If the Power of Interpreting Scripture be in every Mans Brain, what need have we of a Church, or Churchmen? To what purpose then did our Saviour, after He had given his Apostles Power to bind and loose in Heaven and Earth, add to it, That* He would be with them, even to the end of the World? *These Words were not spoken Parabolically, or by way of Figure: Christ was then ascending into his Glory*, and left his Power with his Church, even to the end of the World.

All this the Answerer leaves out; what *relates to the Churches Authority*, and *every Mans following his own Judgment*, having, he says, *been answered already*. I wish he had told us where. For, tho' I remember some Speech of Persons who separate from the Church, and of their Pretences, I cannot call one Word to mind, of the Authority by which they separated. If this be the Answer he means, he compliments

compliments His Majeſty's Papers; For to inſiſt upon it, is to confeſs he has none. He ſaid too, and that too often to be forgotten, That every Man is to judge for himſelf, tho' not for others. What need then of a Church, or Church men, ſays His Majeſty, when every body is provided without them? It ſeems he thinks they are indeed needleſs, but had no mind to ſay ſo.

He takes the matter of Appeals more to heart, in which he takes occaſion to proceed from theſe words: *What Country can ſubſiſt in peace or quiet, where there is not a Supreme Judge, from whence there can be no Appeal?* From whence, the *natural Conſequence*, he ſays, *appears to be, That every National Church ought to have the Supreme Power within it ſelf.* In the Compariſon here made, a National to the Whole Church, is as a Shire to a Kingdom. And a very natural, and very conſiſtent Conſequence it is, That every Sheriff ſhould be a King.

But how come Appeals to a Forreign Juriſdiction, to tend to the Peace and Quiet of a Church? He would peradventure, if one ſhould preſs him, be hard enough put to it, to make Senſe of his Forreign Juriſdiction in our Caſe. For how can any thing be Forreign, but by not belonging to that Aggregate, whether Civil or Spiritual, in reſpect whereof they are ſaid to be Forreigners. Forreign, I think, comes from *Foris*, and ſignifies *out*. So that unleſs the ultimate Juriſdiction of the Church be out of the Church, it ſeems as hard to underſtand how it can be Forreign to any part of the Church, as how a Native of any part of *England*, can be a Forreigner in *England*. The ſeveral Nations, which make the Church, are Forreigners to one another in reſpect of

the ſeveral Temporal Bodies, which they compoſe too, but Fellow-Citizens All in reſpect of the Eccleſiaſtical.

But let this paſs, and the Anſwerer, if he pleaſe, inform us, how the Appeals, of which we talk, can be made, but to what he calls Forreign Juriſdiction. The King aim'd at an end of Differences in Religion, and as he thought every one ought believe as the Catholic Church believes, which Chriſt has here on Earth, calls their Agreement in Faith, a Deciſion; and knowing or ſearching what it is, an Appeal. As no Particular can be the Catholic Church, let him make it intelligible, who can, how the Faith of a Church, compos'd of many Nations, can be known, without knowing the Faith of the Nations which compoſe it; that is, of thoſe Churches which he calls Forreign. It is therefore ſo far from hard, to comprehend how Appeals to Forreigners tend to the Peace and Quiet of a National Church, that when that Peace is diſturbed by Diſſentions in Matters of Religion, it is abſolutely impoſſible to reſettle it without them.

We, ſays the King in the Period before, which the Anſwerer, I know not why, puts after, *have had theſe hundred years paſt, the ſad Effects of denying to the Church that Power in Matters Spiritual, without an Appeal.* And *our Anceſtors*, ſays the Anſwerer, *for many hundred years laſt paſt, found the intollerable Inconveniences of an Appeal to Forreign Juriſdiction.* Which after he has a little dilated, by reckoning up the Particulars, he tauntingly adds, *But theſe were ſlight things, in compariſon to what we have felt theſe hundred years, for want of it.* This Taunt is unexpected, and, by his good favour, might have

have been ſpared, for more Reaſons than one. For what? Do's he in earneſt think, that the Incoveniences he has thought of, and may think of hereafter, hold compariſon with the Inconvenience of Hereſie? Are not all temporal Concerns, let them be what they will, ſlight things in reſpect of the eternal Ruine of ſo many as Hereſie has ſwallow'd up in Perdition? Will he compare the gain of the whole World, to the loſs even of a ſingle Soul?

For the reſt, 'tis ſtrange a Man ſhould toſs a Word ſo long, and never mind what it means. The King us'd the Word *Appeal* with reſpect to the Allegory, in which he ſpeaks: The Anſwerer will needs underſtand it in the Law-ſenſe, and talks all the while of another matter. For the Impoveriſhment, the Obſtruction of Juſtice, and what elſe he mentions, are Conſequences all of Legal Trials betwixt Plaintiff and Defendant, according to the Methods of Courts. In which, where-ever thoſe Courts be, Princes can, and, when they ſee fit, do preſerve their own Prerogatives from diminution, and their Subjects from Oppreſſion, without ſhocking their Religion. There is nothing of all this in the Appeals of which the King ſpeaks, no feeing of Lawyers, nor need to travel from home. Who will but ſtep to St. *James's*, and ſee what they do, and hear what they ſay, has appeal'd as much as the King deſir'd he ſhould. To his Concluſion, That *it is a very ſelf-denying Humour for thoſe to be moſt ſenſible of the want of Appeals, who would really ſuffer the moſt by them*; I ſhall ſay no more than that it is very unreaſonable, becauſe no body dreams of ſuch Appeals as he underſtands, and I wiſh that no body may think worſe of it, and of him and other Folks for it.

Can there be any Juſtice done, ſays the next Paragraph, *where the Offenders are their own Judges, and equal Interpreters of the Law, with thoſe that are appointed to adminiſter Juſtice*? He croſs interrogates, and asks, Whether *there be any likelihood Juſtice ſhould be better done in another Country, by another Authority, and proceeding by ſuch Rules, which in the laſt reſort are but the arbitrary Will of a Stranger*? I have already obſerv'd, That *another Country*, and *another Authority* is unintelligible where all are Countrymen; and arbitrary Rules are altogether as unintelligible, where the Law is fixt and known. At preſent I pray him to tell us how he anſwers the Queſtion. *Can Juſtice be done*? Or, which is the ſame, Is there a Judge without Appeal? ſignifies, he knows, *Can Controverſies be ended?* And he knows the Anſwer is, *They can*, or *They cannot*. And yet he will not ſay either the one or the other, but amuſes us with his Deſcant upon the Metaphor, never touching the Plain-ſong Queſtion. Subordinate Judges may be as true Judges, and Appeals do as much harm as they will; Juſtice too may be as well adminiſtred at home as abroad, for any thing we are the wiſer, or the better. For what is it to us, what becomes of thoſe Matters? We can inform our ſelves time enough of Lawyers, and thoſe who underſtand Government, how they go, when it imports us to know. At preſent let the Anſwerer tell us, whether Controverſies can or cannot be ended? Whether we can be ſecure that we are in the right way to Heaven, or muſt live on at a venture, never knowing whether we live as we ſhould, till we come into the next World, and find perhaps by a ſad Experience, how we have liv'd in this?

We

We are all Travellers to the Country of Happineſs; and as a wrong way can never lead right, it imports us, as much as Happineſs imports, to travel in the right Road. He who undertakes *to aſſiſt* us in *the Difficulties ſtarted by theſe Papers*, acquits himſelf by taking an Allegorical Expreſſion in a Literal ſenſe, and then, by ſhewing Erudition upon it, turning our Thoughts from the Moral. For while we are entertain'd with literally true Judges, and Appeals, and Juſtice, unleſs we think of two things at once, there is no minding Differences in Religion. So that the Aſſiſtance, which it ſeems he meant, was his Aſſiſtance to remove thoſe Difficulties out of ſight; and the Danger he apprehended, the Danger leſt People ſhould once perceive how 'tis with thoſe who are out of the Catholic Church; that they have no accountable Means to end a Controverſie, or ſatisfie a Difficulty, ſave by cleanly conveying it out of the way, if it become importunate. But for any Aſſiſtance towards the only difficulty which imports, Whether People be in the right way to Heaven, or no? Whether Controverſies can, or cannot be ended? we have none from the Anſwerer; but may gueſs from his ſilence, he either thinks They cannot, or wiſhes They would not.

He asks again, Whether *ſuch a one, pretending to a Power he has no right to, muſt be Judge in his own Cauſe, when he is the greateſt Offender?* This *Such a one*, if he take it, as in all reaſon he ſhould, as His Majeſty do's, ſignifies Him, or Thoſe who *are appointed to adminiſter Juſtice.* Do's ſuch a one, in his conceit, pretend, without right, to the Power of Adminiſtring Juſtice? And if they be appointed to adminiſter it in all Cauſes, muſt they not

not administer it in their own? Pray turn this Doctrine to another Subject, and suppose a Question started in *England* about the King's Prerogative. By what Authority should, or could this Question be judg'd, but the King's? As much his own Cause as it is, we must not have another Authority set up in His Kingdom to judge of Differences belonging to His Kingdom. For, deciding Differences being one Part of the Kingly Office, it would be to set up another King. It is palpable, that to apply the Exception of ones own Cause to Supreme Powers, is to make them not Supreme; and yet as irrational and as destructive as it is, People take the confidence to do it.

But if the Answerer mean by his *Such a one*, a *Stranger proceeding by his arbitrary Will*, there neither is nor can be such a one. No Member of the Church can be more a *Stranger* in the Church, than an *Englishman* in *England*. And for *arbitrary Will*, in our Case, there cannot be a wilder Fancy. Christ commanded his Apostles to teach his Doctrine to all Nations. They obey'd his Command; and *their sound is gone forth through the whole earth*. Can the arbitrary Will of any Mortal, stretch it to the utmost extent of Imagination, alter, or conceal, or disguise a Doctrine known and practis'd by a great many Nations, some very remote, and those which are Neighbours agreeing in few things besides that Doctrine? Then as the King would have his Appeal for Justice made to the Catholic Church, so many Millions, as make up that Church, are a very pleasant *arbitrary such a one*.

This, says His Majesty, *is our Case here in* England *in matters Spiritual. For the Protestants are not*

not of the Church of England, *as 'tis the true Church, from whence there can be no Appeal, but becauſe the Diſcipline of that Church is conformable at that preſent to their Fancies, which as ſoon as it ſhall contradict, or vary from, They are really* (he out of an uncorrect Copy ſays *ready*) *to imbrace or joyn with the next Congregation of People, whoſe Diſcipline and Worſhip agrees with their Opinion at that time.* His Copy has *whoſe Diſcipline* or *Worſhip agrees with* the *Opinion* of *that time.* Here is the Moral of the Allegory, which we find by *Juſtice to be done*, underſtood *deciding differences in Matters Spiritual*, that is, in Faith: By thoſe *who are to adminiſter Juſtice* the *Church from which there is no Appeal.* Becauſe Proteſtants do not think themſelves concluded by the Deciſions of the Church of *England*, but adhere to her becauſe they like them at preſent; The King infers there is no Authoritative deciding of Spiritual Differences in *England*, no thruſting out the Hereſies crept in; but every one, in conſequence of his Principles, is to leave the Church of *England* as often as ſhe decides againſt his Perſwaſions, and take up with the next Congregation which is more to his humour. What ſays the Anſwerer to this.

Why, that *the Senſe of this Period is not ſo clear, but that one may eaſily miſtake about it.* Very eaſily without queſtion. For there is not an eaſier thing in the World, than to miſtake, when one will give his mind to it. He is the firſt, tho', I believe, who thought his late Majeſty did not ſpeak intelligible Engliſh. But the Anſwerer will help him out, and tell us *what is aim'd at.* As if what a Man ſays, and what he aims at by ſaying it, were not two things, as different as End and Means. But let him ſet the

Cart

Cart before the Horſe for me, and tell us what was aim'd at. *That we of the Church of* England *have no tie upon us, but that of our own Judgments; and when that changes, we may joyn with Independents or Presbyterians, as we do now with the Church of* England. For one half, His Majeſty, I believe, did think the Church of *England*, as things go, has no tie upon her Members; but his aim was, ſhe might; and it depends on her ſelf whether ſhe will or no. The other half was not only aim'd at, but directly ſaid, and more; that who adhere to Day to the Church of *England* in vertue of their own Fancies, not only may, but ought, quit her for the next Congregation which is more agreeable to thoſe Fancies. How do's the Anſwerer avoid that Conſequence.

Why truly by talking of another Matter. For he asks, *What ſecurity can be greater than that of our own Judgments?* As if it pinched there. His Majeſty talks of thoſe who do not believe, as the Church of *England* do's, for this reaſon, becauſe they are taught by a Church from which there is no Appeal, that is, who have not that Motive for their Judgments which he took for the only, truly reaſonable Motive. And while he is ſpeaking of Motives, the Anſwerer falls a talking of Judgments. The difficulty is not whether Judgment affords Security: (A Judgment grounded on true Reaſon, can no more change than Reaſon:) but whether there be any ſecurity in thoſe Judgments which are made on unſecure Motives. Or if you will, what Security there is in that Judgment, which the Anſwerer offers for Security. 'Tis as in Land. The Security is good, where the Title is unqueſtionable; but if that be doubtful, there is no Money to be borrow'd on the Land.

Land. And he will have us take for Security the Judgment of which we are not ſatisfy'd, that it is it ſelf ſecure.

Once again, His Majeſty thought Church-ſecurity the only Security in this Matter. And it reſts with the Anſwerer to ſhew that Proteſtants either have this or other true Security; to ſhew what other Foundation and Pillar of Truth there is, beſides the Church; how it can be a Foundation without Infallibility, and People have reaſon to truſt their Souls to what may deceive them; In ſhort, what good account they can give of the Hope which is in them, who learn the Faith by which they think to pleaſe God, otherwiſe than from thoſe whom he appointed to teach it. Till he do this, as obſcurely as his Majeſty ſpeaks, People will ſee, they have nothing to truſt to for their Salvation, but Fancy, nor the Church of *England* for their company.

But He *dares appeal to the World, whether They have not made it appear, that it is not Fancy, but Judgment which hath made them firm to the Church of* England? Dares he, in earneſt, put it to the Catholic World, any more than we to the Proteſtant? To what purpoſe theſe great words, when he knows before-hand, nothing will, nor can come of them? It had been a great deal more to purpoſe, ſince Fancy and Judgment, in this place, ſignifie a rational or not rational Perſuaſion, to have ſhew'd, that they truly have Reaſon, who are firm to the Church of *England*, and that They are indeed firm. For that Firmneſs may as well be pretended, as Reaſon for it, and they may deſire to paſs for firm to Her, who make her not firm to her ſelf. But for big talking, none are better at it than Cowards out of Gun-ſhot.

Might it not, asks he on, *as well have been ſaid, That the Proteſtants of the Church of* England *adhered to the Crown in the Times of Rebellion, out of Fancy, and not out of Judgment?* His Zeal for the Church of *England* is wondrous unlucky. As no body thought of detracting from the juſt Praiſes of the Church of *England*, and every body muſt acknowledge her Doctrine in this Point is very Orthodox, and her Practice in the Times of Rebellion conformable to it, there was no need to mention this matter. And yet he will by all means bring it in againſt himſelf. Many, he knows, did deſert her, and her Doctrine in this Point, at that time; ſo many, that the Rebellion peradventure was indebted for its Succeſs to thoſe Deſerters. For had not the ill-affected Rabble been countenanc'd and headed, by Men who had, perhaps, all their Life before conform'd to the Church of *England*, the Rebellion either would not have been at all, or not ſo unfortunately proſperous. Now, as it is plain, that if thoſe who deſerted, had ever adhered to her, with a perſuaſion, that they were oblig'd to believe what ſhe taught, They could not have deſerted her in this Point, who always taught Loyalty; This very Caſe proves what the King aſſerts, That till they do ſo, there is no ſecurity of their adhering to her. For they may deſert her in any other Point of Chriſt's Doctrine, as well as they did in this, and for ought appears will, when they meet with the ſame Intereſt, or whatever Motive They had to deſert her then.

In the laſt place, He tries to turn the Argument upon the Church of *Rome*, *to which*, he asks, *why any adhere, but becauſe it is agreeable to their Judgment ſo to do?* This Actor went off the Stage but now,

now, and needed not return so soon, with no wiser a Part. For what do's he mean by *Adhering*? Believing, I suppose, that the Church of *Rome* is in the right. For he talks not sure of acting outwardly in conformity to our inward Persuasions, which all, but Hypocrites, do in all their Actions. And if he mean it of the inward Persuasion, to ask, *why They adhere, but because they judge they ought*, is in other words, *Why do they adhere, but because they adhere*? For their Judgment is their Adhesion. To ask why People adhere to a Church, with every body else signifies, What Reason or Motive have they for their adhering?

To which Question, with respect to the *Roman* Catholic Church, the Answer, in the words of the Paragraph, is, That People *are of her, as 'tis the true Church, from whence there can be no Appeal*; or, because she is the Church which Christ has now on Earth, with whom his Doctrine was deposited, and from whom only it can be learn'd. In the words of St. *Austin*; *I am kept in the Bosom of the Catholic Church, by the consent of People and Nations; by an Authority begun by Miracles, nourish'd by Hope, increas'd by Charity, establish'd by Antiquity; by a Succession of Bishops from St.* Peter, *to whom our Lord, after his Resurrection, recommended his Sheep to be fed, to the present Bishop: lastly, by the very Name of* Catholic, *with so much reason appropriated to that Church, that as much as all Heretics desire to be call'd Catholics, yet if a Stran-*

Tenet consensio populorum [illegible] gentium: tenet authoritas [illegible] inchoata, spe nutrita, [illegible] cta, vetustate firmata: tenet [illegible] sede Petri Apostoli, [illegible] pascendas oves suas post resurrectionem Dominus commendavit, usque ad præsentem Episcopatum [illegible] Sacerdotum; tenet postremo ipsum Catholicæ nomen, quod non sine causa inter tam multas Hæreses [illegible] Ecclesia sola [illegible] Hæretici se Catholicos [illegible] quærenti tamen peregrino [illegible] ad Catholicam [illegible] Hæreticorum vel [illegible] domum audeat [illegible] *Epist. Fund.*

ger inquire where Catholics meet, none of them have the confidence to direct him to their Congregations. The Answerer will tell us when he thinks fit, what Answer he thinks proper to be made for other Churches. In the mean time, let us reflect what he has answer'd to the Paragraph.

He has told us, That there is no Security greater than that of our Judgments: That theirs is Judgment not Fancy, and particularly was so in the times of Rebellion: And that they Judge in the Church of *Rome* too. What is all this to the Paragraph, which says in short, That because Protestants have no firm Motive for their adhering to the Church of *England*, they cannot be firm to her. Do's he make it appear their Motive is firm? Or how They will be firm without one? This little is all there was before him; is their Judgment solidly grounded, or is it not? the only and whole business. What need was there to talk of Judgment in common, when the Question is of their Judgment in this Particular? Or what serves it for, but to make a shew, and fill up a Page? There may be as much Security in the Judgment as there will, and Protestants be never the better, unless there be Security in *their* Judgment. They will, I hope, since their Souls are at stake, consider what they do to venture them, where those, who write against Kings, are not able to shew they have any Security. It is enough to my purpose to have observ'd that his Majesty asks for a secure Motive, and can get no Answer.

There remains to see, by his Objections against Catholic Doctrine, what he takes for Fancy, and what for Judgment. According to him, They *Fancy* who are for an *Infallible Judge*; and They *Judge*,

Judge, who to be ſure of a right deciſion of differences in Religion, look out for a *Fallible Judge*, and hazard their Salvation, on what may deceive them. They *Fancy*, who are for an *Unwritten Word*; They *Judge*, who think the Word of God is made by Writing. *Giving Honour to God by the Worſhip of Images*, is *Fancy*; and *Judgment*, that giving Honour to God, is not giving Honour to God. For giving Honour any way, is plainly giving Honour. *Mediators of Interceſſion beſides the Mediator of Redemption* are *Fancy*; and ſo to think, becauſe only one could Redeem us, no body beſides can Pray for us, is *Judgment*. *The Doctrine of Concomitancy*, *Fancy*; and true Chriſtian *Judgment*, that the Body and Blood of *Chriſt* can now be ſeparated, and he die again. A *Subſtantial change in the Elements*, *Fancy*; and right *Judgment*, that the Apoſtles did not underſtand what *Chriſt* ſaid to them, or not inſtruct the Church as they believ'd themſelves. So 'tis with his laſt inſtance of Purgatory, and all the reſt. Our Judgment is the Judgment of *the Church from which there is no Appeal*, and it reſts with the Anſwerer to ſhew, how any other Judgment can be more than *meer Fancy*; or *Giddineſs*, to diſpatch the next Paragraph under one. Men are giddy, or ſettled, as they are guided or not guided by Reaſon; and he ſhould ſhew what Reaſon beſides can ſettle them, if he would talk to the purpoſe. But he inſtead of it, tells us, we are beholding to our Brains for whatever we believe; as if every body did not know, that the Brain is always the Inſtrument of Judgment, whether we judge wiſely or foolihly; or it concern'd us to be ſolicitous about the Inſtrument, while we inquire after the Hand which plays upon it.

I desire to know therefore, says His Majesty, *of every serious Considerer of these things, whether the great Work of our Salvation ought to depend on such a sandy Foundation as this?* That is, says the Answerer, the *Private Judgment.* Can a Man expect there should be any Answer to this, but that our Salvation ought, or ought not depend on Sand; or that the Foundation of Private Judgment is, or is not Sandy? And yet the Answerer makes a shift to spin out a Paragraph, without one word of either.

I, says he, *have seriously considered this matter, and must declare, That I find no Christian Church built on a more sandy Foundation, than that, which pretends to be settled on a Rock*, as to part of her Faith. If that Church build on Sand too, she will, I suppose hear on't in due time. At present, he who considers so much, might consider, that he is not ask'd what he has considered, or what he has found; but, whether any Church That, if he will, among the rest ought to build on Sand? and whether Private Judgment be more than Sand? Plain *I*, or *No*, if it please him, first, and then *a l'autre.*

Then he tells us That *no understanding Man builds upon his own Judgment.* He takes, I suppose, the Advice of his Friends in Compliment: For after all, he is to be his own Judge. But is his Judgment, and their Advice, and what you will, besides the Judgment of the Church without Appeal, a Foundation to build upon? There is the Knot which the Answerer should now untie.

But no Man of understanding can believe without his Judgment. Sure enough; nor no Man of not-understanding neither: for his Belief is his Judgment. But I am cloy'd with this Dish. What

Stand

Stand there is to ſet it upon, is now the Queſtion.

I appeal, ſays the Anſwerer, *to any ingenuous Man, whether he doth not as much build upon his own Judgment, who chuſeth the Church, as he that chuſeth Scripture for his Rule*? Every ingenuous Man, who reads theſe Papers, will tell him, that *to build upon ones own Judgment*, is the ſame with *following ones own Fancy*, being *ones own Judge*, and what other Terms a Maſter of *Engliſh*, in all Senſes, uſed, to expreſs, in variety of Phraſes, *Judging unreaſonably*. Let the Anſwerer, in ſtead of telling us what we all know as well as he, That every one Judges, who Judges, tell's what we do not know, what Reaſon they have to chuſe the Scripture, not the Church, for their Rule.

He that chuſeth the Church, hath many more Difficulties to conquer, than the other hath. How ſo? For this ſounds like a Paradox. Thoſe many more Difficulties, to my thinking, muſt be conquer'd, before one can come at Scripture. For unleſs we firſt chuſe the Church for a Rule to find out Scripture, by whom alone St. *Auſtin* has told us we know it, there will be no aſſurance of Scripture for us to chuſe. And then in the choice of the Church, there is but one thing to mind, and that no difficulty neither, *where, or which the Church is?* When that is ſettled, a Man has no more to do, but believe as he is taught, and live as he believes. Who thinks he has conquer'd the difficulties about the Letter of Scripture, as which Books belong to the Canon, which not? which is a right Tranſlation or Reading, which wrong? and whatever falls in his way; has at leaſt as many remaining, as he has paſt, and which if he find not inſuperable, he is, I believe, the more beholding

beholding to his *Will*. For I know not how to have any Opinion of his *Judgment*, who, only becauſe ſuch words will bear his Senſe, as they will, it may be twenty others, all abetted by Men of Name, ventures his Soul upon't that his is juſt the Senſe meant by the Holy Ghoſt. But let us hear his Reaſon.

For the Church can never be a Rule without the Scriptures, but the Scriptures may, without the Church, that is, without Faithful. For a Congregation of them is a Church. Will he perſuade us there were no Faithful in the World before *Moſes*? No Chriſtians before the *New Teſtament*, which was written by Chriſtians? and no part of it till ſeveral Years after the Reſurrection. Do's not St. *Irenæus* inform us, that more than one Nation had the Doctrine of *Chriſt* and no Scriptures? And will he make us believe, that all theſe were Faithful without any Rule for their Faith? and that the Church depends on *Writing*, which if it ſhould be loſt in the World, there would be an end of the Church? Again, of what, and to whom ſhould Scripture be a Rule, if there were no Faith, nor Faithful? Paradoxes a part, and the attempt to unriddle one by another, let the Anſwerer tell us, if he pleaſe, whether our Salvation ought to ſtand upon Sand; and to deal plainly, whether he think that they who ſtand, whether on the Church, or Scripture, do not build both on Sand? For by ſaying nothing for Scripture, and yet making it worſe on the Churches ſide, one would gueſs he is of Opinion, there is no ſteadineſs in either. And it would be well to ſpeak plain,

Quid autem ſi neque Apoſtoli quidem Scripturas reliquiſſent nobis, nonne opportebat ordinem ſequi Traditionis, quam tradiderunt iis quibus committebant Eccleſias? cui ordinationi aſſentiunt multæ Gentes Barbarorum, eorum qui in Chriſtum credunt, ſine charta & atramento ſcriptam habentes per ſpiritum in cordibus ſuis ſalutem, & veterem Traditionem diligenter cuſtodientes. *Irenæus adverſ. Hæreſ. Lib.* 3. *c.* 4.

plain, that People may leave off dealing, where there is no Security, and troubling themſelves no longer with the uncertainties of Religion, turn their Thoughts to more ſolid things.

Whether it be *eaſie* or no *to find the Churches Infallibility in the Scripture*, has been anſwered by Her Royal Highneſs; and I will not preſume to anſwer where ſhe has, eſpecially when the Queſtion has no relation to our Buſineſs.

In the laſt place, who has found the Churches Infallibility, has yet, ſays the Anſwerer, *a harder Point to get over*, viz. *How the Promiſes relating to the Church in general, came to be appropriated to the Church of* Rome? By the way, the Promiſes of which he talks, are they not in Scripture? and no harder to be found there by another, than by him? How comes the Churches Infallibility to be eaſily found there in this Period, which was not eaſie to find in the laſt? For who has found the Promiſe, has found Infallibility, as certainly as that the Promiſes of *Chriſt* never fail. But why are we not all agreed now? That there are Promiſes of Infallibility made to the Church in general he agrees, and doubts not, I ſuppoſe, but that thoſe Promiſes are made good. I ſuppoſe, too, he will allow that the Church in General, and the General Church are all one, and that the General, and the Catholic Church are but two Names for the ſame thing. And ſo we are arriv'd at Infallibility in the Catholic Church. Yes; but it muſt not *be appropriated to the Church of* Rome. Why, it ſhall not, if that will content him. We ask no more, than what he allows. That the Catholic Church be Infallible, and the Church of *Rome*, with all her faults, one of the many Churches which

make it up. To allow ſo much, is to allow the *Roman* Catholic Church is Infallible. For *Roman* Catholic is nothing but the Catholic with the *Roman* in. What remains then, but to take the Infallibility promis'd to this Catholic Church for the Foundation of our Salvation, inquire and believe what ſhe teaches, and leave off diſputing? For they are undoubtedly firmly grounded who build on the Promiſes of God.

It is true, the Anſwerer has not all this while anſwered the Queſtion. For he ſays not, whether Salvation ought to depend on a Sandy Foundation; or whether the private Judgment be a Sandy Foundation. But he has done much better, by inſtructing People the Catholic Church is Infallible, and ſhall for me keep his Thoughts of that Matter to himſelf, ſince he has no mind to reveal them. People, I hope, will profit by his Inſtructions, and for their own ſakes chuſe Infallible, rather than Fallible Security for their Souls, now they know where 'tis to be had.

There follow ſeveral lines in his Majeſties Paper, which are not tranſcrib'd by the Anſwerer, becauſe they are, he ſays, as effectual for the Church of *England*, as *Rome*. And truly I am of his mind, that the Church of *England* has her ſhare in thoſe favours as much as any particular Church, if ſhe be, as they are, incorporated into the General. For neither do they claim otherwiſe; nor can the Favours granted by God to the Faithful, be imagined extended to the not-faithful. It is for this Reaſon I have always thought them no Friends of hers, who make her of a different Faith from all, or indeed any part of the Catholic Church, that is, no part her ſelf. For evidently there is no pretending to the Priviledges of

a Body,

a Body, but by being a Member; nor pretending to be of the Body of Faithful, but by Faith.

And pray conſider, ſays the King, *on the other ſide that thoſe who reſiſt the Truth, and will not ſubmit to his Church, draw their Arguments from Implications, and far fetch'd Interpretations, at the ſame time that they deny plain and poſitive words; which is ſo great a diſingenuity, that 'tis not almoſt to be thought, that they can believe themſelves.*

Here are two particulars mentioned; drawing Arguments from Implications, and denying plain words. In anſwer to the firſt, out of the whole heap of Controverſies, the Anſwerer chuſes Three, in which they have, he ſays, *plain and poſitive words on their ſide.* Now it had been altogether as eaſie, and as ſhort, to have produc'd thoſe plain and poſitive words, if there had been any, as to have paſt his word that there are ſuch. Beſides that People love to ſee with their own Eyes, and plain things may eaſily be ſeen; He is a Party, and even Supreme Powers, according to him, muſt not judge in their own Cauſe. It reſts then with him, to ſhew where the Scripture ſays *No*, of what the *Roman* Catholic Church ſays *I*, or contrariwiſe. For this is what People underſtand by plain and poſitive, and all beſides is Implication. And by the favour of his Confidence, I affirm to him, that who argue againſt the *Roman* Catholic Church, out of Scripture, argue *always* from Implications: tho' it be more than needs to juſtifie His Majeſties Aſſertion. For if they draw their Arguments from Implications *at any time*, they draw Arguments from Implications.

In anſwer to the Second, he pitches upon a point wherein he acknowledges the words of Scripture

ſeem plain and poſitive on our ſide, and their Senſe to be *from Implications and far-fetch'd Interpretations*, and alledges what he has to ſay, why, notwithſtanding, they are not plain and poſitive. As if there were any other way of denying plain Words of Scripture, but by denying them to be plain. No Chriſtian has the confidence to deny what Scripture plainly teaches; but who has no mind to believe what it teaches, denies that it teaches contrary to him, and for a Pretence to deny That, raiſes ſome Miſt or other, to obſcure the Clearneſs of every Text alledg'd againſt him. The Anſwerer then is far enough from ſhewing, that they do not deny plain Words of Scripture, by pretending that they are not plain; nor did nor could His Majeſty mean they denied them otherwiſe, who knew very well that there is no other way to do it, and that no Words are ſo plain, but who will make it his buſineſs, may find ſomething to ſay againſt them. This which the Anſwerer alledges, was far from a Secret to Him.

In ſhort, the Anſwerer would have them cleared from arguing from Implications, by ſaying, they have, in three Points, plain Words, which he thought it needleſs to produce; and from denying plain Words, by denying that they are plain. And this is all his Anſwer. What he ſays of Implications in the Pope's Bulls, might, if he could ſhew the Church of *Rome* builds her Faith on thoſe Implications, be an Argument againſt her, but none for himſelf. For *Paul* is not a jot the leſs a Thief, becauſe *Peter* is caught ſtealing too. But, ſome in the Church of *Rome* argue from Implications, upon which they do not build their Faith, therefore others may build

their

their Faith upon Implications, ſeems to me but an odd Argument.

The King's Concluſion is; *Is there any other Foundation of the Proteſtant Church, but that, if the Civil Magiſtrate pleaſe, he may call ſuch of the Clergy as he thinks fit for his turn at that time, and turn the Church either to Presbytery, or Independency, or indeed what he pleaſes? This was the way of our Pretended Reformation here in* England. *And by the ſame Rule and Authority, it may be alter'd into as many Shapes and Forms, as there are Fancies in Mens Heads.*

This, ſays the Anſwerer, *looks like a very unkind Requital to the Church of* England, *for her Zeal in aſſerting the Magiſtrates Power againſt a Forreign Juriſdiction; to infer from thence, That the Magiſtrate may change the Religion here which way he pleaſes.* I need not obſerve, that this is no Anſwer, becauſe I ſuppoſe it was not meant for one. It ſeems rather a kind of Complaint, to my thinking very unreaſonable. For he is a great deal more juſtly to be complain'd of, who takes a concerning Truth unkindly, than he who ſpeaks it. Religion, I think, ſhould not depend on Compliments; and I pray God preſerve me from the Kindneſs, which, not to fail in the Punctilio's of nice Civility, forbears to tell me what may be uſeful to my Salvation. Again, Zeal againſt Forreign Juriſdiction very well might, and, much more according to knowledge, actually did appear in *England*, without any alteration in Religion: a thing to which I am perſuaded neither Magiſtrate nor Church have reaſon to think themſelves beholding; becauſe it was the Gap at which the Hereſies crept in, of which His Majeſty complains,

plains, and which not long ſince ruin'd Both. Neither is any Inference made from that Zeal; but a plain Queſtion ask'd, to which a plain Anſwer would much better become the Part he now acts, and ſhew much more Zeal to Truth, and to the Church of *England*, than talking of her Zeal unſeaſonably.

But although we attribute the Supreme Juriſdiction to the King, yet we do not queſtion, but there are inviolable Rights of the Church, which ought to be preſerv'd againſt the Fancies of ſome, and Uſurpations of others. Rights! and Fancies! and Uſurpations! Pray let him keep theſe things till their time come, and tell us at preſent, why the Proteſtant Church may not be alter'd, as it was made, by the Authority of the Magiſtrate, and Concurrence of ſuch of the Clergy as are for his turn? This, if he have forgot it, is the Queſtion. For the Rights of the Church, his Care will be more ſeaſonable, when he has ſettled the Foundation.

We do by no means make our Religion mutable according to the Magiſtrates Pleaſure. But only according to the Pleaſure of other Folks, perhaps. If it be immutable, let us ſee the immutable Foundation, which makes it ſo, and have ſome Reaſon to think it ſo. There it ſticks. Barely to ſay it is immutable, coſts nothing; nor was there ever ſo great a Criminal, who could not ſay, *Not guilty.*

For the Rule of our Religion is unalterable, being the Holy Scripture. Not to turn our preſent Queſtion into a Diſpute about the Rule of Faith, I pray him to make it appear that the Holy Scripture is ſuch a Foundation as makes the Proteſtant Church unalterable. The Letter of Scripture is common to

all,

all, who bare the name of Christians, and may be as much a Foundation to every, as to any one. The Sense is not a Foundation of Religion, but Religion it self. As Protestants build Protestancy upon Scripture, the Presbyterians build Presbytery, the Independents Independency, and every one his own Religion. Their several Religions are nothing but their several Expositions of the same words. Why now, is this Foundation more unalterable, in respect of the Protestant Church, than any other? It sustain'd a Catholic Building heretofore; It sustains a Protestant now. Why may not the same Hands which removed the Catholic, and set up the Protestant in its place, remove the Protestant, and set up the Presbyterian, the Independent Building, or what you will; this is the Question, to which a Body would have expected an Answer from an Answerer. But he in stead of thinking of that Matter, gives us for an unalterable Foundation of Protestant Religion, a Foundation upon which all the Alterations of Religion, which are, and perhaps ever have been, pretend to stand as much as the Protestant.

But the exercise of Religion *is under the Regulation of the Laws of the Land.* Must the Laws which regulate the Exercise of Religion be obey'd, *not only for Wrath but for Conscience*, or must they not? If they must, People are oblig'd to exercise a new Religion, as often as the Laws appoint a new Exercise. For they cannot exercise one Religion, and be of another. And then they are oblig'd in Conscience to alter their Religion, as the Laws alter, from Protestant to Presbyterian or Independent, or as the Law pleases. If such Laws are not to be obey'd, that the exercise of Religion is under the

Regulation

Regulation of the Laws, ſignifies, that People may be puniſh'd for not doing what in Conſcience they are not oblig'd to do. So Chriſtianity is under the Regulation of Pagan, or Turkiſh Laws, and every weaker Man under the Regulation of a ſtronger; which to my Ears ſounds odly. But take it which way you will, the Caſe is equal. If there be an Obligation from the Laws, there may be an Obligation to the Presbyterian, or Independent Exerciſe and Religion when the Law pleaſes: And if there be none, Presbytery indeed, and Independency cannot be impos'd upon our Conſciences by Law; but they may be as much ſettled as Proteſtancy is now. For all are under the ſame Regulation, with the ſame either Obligation, or not Obligation from that Regulation.

He concludes with a Prayer, with which it is as with Scripture. Take it right, and 'tis a good Prayer: but yet they may joyn in it, who will be *Good Chriſtians*, and *Loyal Subjects* no longer, than their King is a *Nurſing Father to their Church*.

But now he is parting from His Majeſty, it will not be amiſs to reflect how it ſtands between them. His Majeſty, as he had perhaps more reaſon than other Men, was deeply ſenſible of the ſad effects of Differences in Religion, which he ſaw muſt needs laſt, till an effectual courſe be taken to compoſe them. Wrangling about particular Points, that is, turning Religion into Ergotery, He had reaſon to think would never do it. For there never came ſo bad a Cauſe into *Weſtminſter-Hall*, nor ever will into the Church, for which no Argument can be made. As long as Men have Tongues, they will never want ſomething to ſay, which 'tis but dreſſing

up

up in handſome Language, and it may take with thoſe who diſtinguiſh not the Plauſible from the Solid. The bare name of an Anſwer, is enough to make a ſhew, and keep up the Reputation of not being overcome, and ſo much is Victory to one ſide. In ſhort, Men die, and Diſputes live, and all that comes of them is what was long ſince obſerv'd, *There is no end of writing many Books.* He ſaw beſides, that it agrees not with the Goodneſs of God, and His care of Man, to leave us at uncertainties, which without Infallibility he ſaw unavoidable. And therefore wiſh'd People, in ſtead of floating uncertainly up and down in the Ocean of Diſputes, to take Port in that one Church which *Chriſt* has upon Earth, and to which Power was given to govern us in Matters of Faith, and a promiſe of perpetual aſſiſtance. Which Church, he ſays, is vibſily the *Roman* Catholic.

The Anſwerer flatly denies the *Roman* Catholic to be the one Church of *Chriſt*, for Reaſons, ever ſince St. *Cyprians* Days, condemn'd by all Chriſtians; and never minds that he denies two terms the ſame with a third, to be the ſame between themſelves. For Church of *Chriſt*, and Catholic Church, are the ſame, both ſignifying all the particular Churches which believe the Doctrine of *Chriſt*. Again, *Roman* Catholic, is the ſame too with Catholic: for both ſignifie likewiſe all the ſame Churches, with the *Roman* for one of the number, which the Anſwerer acknowledges ſhe is. Catholic, ſays All, and who ſays All ſays *Roman*, if ſhe be one; And who ſays *Roman* Catholic, ſays thoſe very All, neither more nor leſs; And yet the Anſwerer can fancy a difference. For the

reſt he gives no direct Anſwer, that I remember to any one Queſtion, yet hovers ſo about it, that one muſt keep his thoughts very attentive, not to have them diverted quite another way. As for Certainty or Uncertainty, they are Matters which he ſeems not to mind. Not but that he talks of a ſure Compaſs, and Infallible Rule: but he never tells us, whether, or how a Man ſhall be ſure, that he do's indeed ſteer by that Compaſs, or is guided by that Rule. Thoſe great ſounds vaniſh into Conſcience at laſt, and that Conſcience may be right or wrong, for any care he takes; as perhaps he thinks it equal, whether the one, or the other. The King deſired People ſhould have ſure hold, and ſhews them where they may: He is only ſolicitous to keep them from faſtning there, and leaves them to find another, if they can of themſelves, or be content, if they will, without any. If he have a Pique to the *Roman* Catholic, he may ſhew them another Catholic Church, or, if a Church be needleſs, on what they may reſt ſecurely without a Church. If on Scripture, he may ſhew them, how they may ſafely ſtake their Souls, that they do not miſtake it: If on Conſcience, how they may ſecurely truſt it. Let People be but ſafe, and I ask no more. But as there is, after all but one way to Heaven, the King ſhews it, and he imputes deceit to him for his pains; and then ſets up for the faithful Friend himſelf, who will neither let them go that way, nor ſhew them that there is any other. And thus it ſtands between them.

It is for the Reader to conſider, which of the two gives him better Counſel, and where he can find better Security, than what His Majeſty offers,

or

or whether Security be needleſs. One would think it not like to take up much Conſideration in our Country, whether, in a concern of infinite more value than all the Money, which troubles ſo many Lawyers and Scriveners, one ſhould deal without looking after Security. And yet, by whatever charm it happens, there needs a great deal of Grace, to make People ſenſible in this Caſe, of what in all others they are but too much, their greateſt concerns. *God of his Mercy grant it to all who ask it, and to all, who by not asking it, ſhew they more need it.*

A DEFENCE OF THE Third Paper.

I Dare appeal to all unprejudic'd Readers, and eſpecially to thoſe who have any ſenſe of Piety, whether upon peruſal of the Paper written by Her late Highneſs the Ducheſs, they have not found in it ſomewhat which touch'd them to the very Soul; whether they did not plainly and perfectly diſcern in it the Spirit of Meekneſs, Devotion, and Sincerity, which animates the whole Diſcourſe; and whether the Reader be not ſatisfied, that ſhe who writ it has open'd her Heart without diſguiſe, ſo as not to leave a Scruple that ſhe was not in earneſt. I am ſure I can ſay, for my own particular, that when I read it firſt in Manuſcript, I could not but conſider it as a Diſcourſe extremely moving, plain, without Artifice, and diſcovering the Piety of the Soul from which it flow'd. Truth has a

Language

Language to it ſelf, which 'tis impoſſible for Hypocriſie to imitate: Diſſimulation could never write ſo warmly, nor with ſo much life. What leſs than the Spirit of Primitive Chriſtianity could have dictated her Words? The loſs of Friends, of worldly Honours, and Eſteem, the Defamation of ill Tongues, and the Reproach of the Croſs, all theſe, though not without the ſtruglings of Fleſh and Blood, were ſurmounted by her; as if the Saying of our Saviour were always ſounding in her Ears, *What will it profit a man to gain the whole world, and loſe his Soul!*

I think I have amplified nothing in relation either to this Pious Lady, or her Diſcourſe: I am ſure I need not. And now let any unbiaſs'd and indifferent Reader compare the Spirit of the Anſwerer with hers. Do's there not manifeſtly appear in him a quite different Character? Need the Reader be inform'd, that he is diſingenuous, foul-mouth'd, and ſhuffling; and that, not being able to anſwer plain Matter of Fact, he endeavours to evade it, by Suppoſitions, Circumſtances, and Conjectures; like a cunning Barreter of Law, who is to manage a ſinking Cauſe, the Diſhoneſty of which he cannot otherwiſe ſupport, than by defaming his Adverſary? Her only Buſineſs is to ſatisfie her Friends of the inward Workings of her Soul, in order to her Converſion, and by what Methods ſhe quitted the Religion in which ſhe was educated. He on the contrary, is not ſatisfied, unleſs he queſtion the Integrity of her Proceedings, and the Truth of her plain Relation, even ſo far as to blaſt, what in him lies, her Bleſſed Memory, with the imputation of Forgery and Deceit; as if ſhe had given a falſe Account, not only of the Paſſages in her Soul, and the Agonies of a troubl'd

troubl'd Conſcience, only known to God and to her ſelf, but alſo of the Diſcourſes which ſhe had with others concerning thoſe Diſquiets. Every where the Lie is to be caſt upon her, either directly, in the Words of the Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, which he quotes; or indirectly, in his own, in which his ſpiteful Diligence is moſt remarkable.

In his Anſwer to the two former Papers there ſeems to have been ſome reſtraint upon the virulence of his *Genius*, though even there he has manifeſtly paſt the Bounds of Decency and Reſpect: But ſo ſoon as he has got looſe from diſputing with Crown'd Heads, he ſhews himſelf in his pure Naturals, and is as buſie in raking up the Aſhes of their next Relations, as if they were no more of kin to the Crown, than the New Church of *England* is to the Old Reformation of their Great-Grandfathers. But God forbid that I ſhould think the whole Epiſcopal Clergy of this Nation to be of his Latitudinarian Stamp; many of them, as Learn'd as himſelf, are much more Moderate: And ſuch, I am confident, will be as far from abetting his Irreverence to the Royal Family, as they are from the jugling Deſigns of his Faction, to draw in the Nonconformiſts to their Party, by aſſuring them they ſhall not be proſecuted (as indeed, upon their Principles, they cannot be by them); but in the mean time this is to wreſt the Favour out of the King's Hands, and take the Beſtowing it into their own; and to reaſſume to themſelves that Headſhip of the *Engliſh* Church, which their Anceſtors gave away to King *Henry* the Eighth. And now let any Loyal Subject but conſider whether this new way of their Proceeding do's not rather tend to bring the Church of

England

England into the Fanatics, than the Fanatics into the Church of *England*.

These are the Arts which are common to him and his Fellow-labourers; but his own peculiar Talent is that of subtle Calumny and sly Aspersion, by which he insinuates into his Readers an ill Opinion of his Adversaries, before he comes to Argument; and takes away their Good Name rather by Theft than open Robbery. He lays a kind of accumulative Dishonesty to their Charge, and touches 'em here and there with Circumstances, in stead of positive Proofs, till at last he leaves a bad Impression of 'em; like a Painter who makes Blotches of hard Colouring in several Parts of the Face, which he smooths afterwards into a Likeness. After this manner he, or one of his Brethren in Iniquity, has us'd *Monsieur de Condom*, by picking up Stories against him in his Preface, which he props up with little Circumstances, but seldom so positive that he cannot come off, when their Falsity shall be detected. In the mean time, his Cause go's forward with the Common Reader; who, prepossest by the Preface, is made partial to his Answer. The same kind of Artifice, with some little variation, has been us'd in other of their Books, besides this present Libel against the Duchess.

But, the Cloven-foot of this our Answerer, appears from underneath the Cassock, even in the first step he makes towards his Answer to the present Paper: *Which*, he tells us, *is said to be written by a great Lady.* How doubtfully he speaks, as if there were no certainty of the Author. But surely 'tis more than barely said; for 'tis Publish'd by the same Authority, which order'd the two other Papers written

ten

ten by His late Majesty to the Press; and the Original of it, is still remaining in the Hands of the present King: Indeed the Bishop of *Winchester* may seem to have given him some encouragement for this in the Preface to his Treatises, where he tells us, *That* Maimbourg *the Jesuite recites something which he says was written by the late Duchess*; and which he afterwards calls *the Papers pretended to be written by Her.* But if that Bishop had liv'd to see what our Answerer has seen, Her Paper Printed and Publish'd by His Majesty, I cannot think he wou'd have been so incredulous as to have made that doubt. It may be allow'd him to suspect a Stranger of Forgery; but with what face can this Son of the Church of *England* suspect the Integrity of his King? In the mean time, observe what an excellent Voucher he has got of this dead Bishop, and what an excellent Argument he has drawn from him. Because he would not believe what he did not think she said, we must not believe what we know she did say. Let our Author therefore come out of his Mists and Ambiguities, or give us some better Authority for his unreasonable Doubts: For, at this rate, if it be already suspected, whether what she writes be Matter of Fact, and indeed, whether she writ it at all; it may be doubted hereafter, whether she chang'd, and perhaps, whether there were ever such a Woman.

After he had thus begun, That *this Paper was said to be written by a Great Lady, for the satisfaction of her Friends*; he shuffles in commodious Words for an Answerer, and which afford him Elbow-room: For he talks of the Reasons and Motives which she had for her leaving the Communion of the Church of *England*, &c. and of the Right which all Readers

have to judge of the ſtrength of them. Now, as Luck will have it, none of thoſe Motives and Reaſons are to be found in the Paper of her Highneſs: She expreſſes her ſelf clearly to write for the Satisfaction of her Friends, not as to the Reaſons ſhe had her ſelf for changing, but as to the Cenſures which ſhe might expect from them for ſo doing: and her whole Paper ſhews this was only her Deſign. So that, againſt the Law of all Romances, he firſt builds the Enchanted Caſtle, and then ſets up to be the Doughty Knight who conquers it. It ſeems he found, that a bare Denial, which is the proper Anſwer to Matter of Fact, was a dry Buſineſs, and would make no ſport; and therefore he would be ſure to cut himſelf out ſufficient Work. But it is not every Mans Talent to force a Trade; for a Cuſtomer may chuſe whether he will buy or not.

This Great Perſon chang'd not lightly, nor in haſte; but after all the Endeavours which could be us'd, by a Soul which was true to it ſelf, and to its Eternal Intereſt. She was ſenſible, as I before hinted, that ſhe ſhould loſe her Friends and Credit, and what to her Condition at that time was more ſharply piercing, expoſe the Catholics of *England* to the danger of ſuffering for her ſake. On theſe Conſiderations ſhe makes a plain Relation of all the Paſſages in her Change; and expecting ſevere Cenſures from the World, took care to ſatisfie her Friends concerning it. As for the Reaſons of it, they were only betwixt God and her own Soul, and the Prieſt with whom ſhe ſpoke at laſt. What a wonderful Art has this Gentleman, to turn a bare Narrative into Motives and Inducements? When he is arriv'd

to

to the Perfection of calling down a Saint from Heaven, he may examine her concerning them; in the mean time he must be content with the Relation which she has left behind her here on Earth; and if he will needs be mistaking her Scruples for her Motives, who can help it?

His Design, as he tells us a little after the beginning, *is to vindicate the Honour of the Church of* England, *so far as it may be thought to suffer by the Paper of her late Highness.* I might here tell him, that he has an Obligation antecedent to the Honour of his Community, which is that to God and his own Conscience. But the Honour of the Church of *England* is no farther concern'd in the Paper of her Highness, than in relation to the Persons of two or three Prelates; and those he leaves at last to shift for themselves as they are able, with this melancholy Farewell, That *God be thanked, the Cause of our Church do's not depend upon the singular Opinion of one or two Bishops in it, wherein they apparently recede from the establish'd Doctrine of it.*

In the next place, *he is sensible how nice and tender a thing it is to meddle in a Matter wherein the Memory of so Great a Lady is concern'd.*

Here he is sensible, once for all; for after this one Civility, you heat no more of his Good Manners to the end of the Chapter; but the Honour of the Church of *England* so wholly takes up his thoughts, that he forgets the Respect which is due to her Sex, her Quality, her Memory, her Relations, and confutes her as coursly as the Parson did *Bellarmine.*

He go's on to inform us, how hard a Task he has undertaken in answering these Papers, *wherein such Circumstances are mention'd as cannot fully be clear'd,*

the Parties themſelves having been many years dead; yet he ſhall endeavour to keep within due Bounds, &c.

Theſe due Bounds either are, or ought to be, Reſpect to the Great Lady, and Caution in regard of Circumſtances, which I hope he will not put upon his Readers for Arguments, the Parties being dead ſo long ago.

But let the Reader here take notice, that in this very Place he is clapping his Cups together, and ſhuffling his Balls from Hand to Hand, to lay the Foundation of his Jugling, and to prepare the way for all the Tricks which he is to play hereafter.

For the Parties being dead long ſince, that is, the Ducheſs, in the firſt place, not being alive to juſtifie the ſeveral Conferences which ſhe had with the Biſhops; nor they, in the ſecond, to anſwer as in the ſight of God, whether ſhe had ſuch Diſcourſe with them, the Field is open for him, as he vainly imagines, by laying Circumſtances of Time and Place together, and racking her own Paper till it ſeemingly ſpeaks againſt her, to render it ſuſpected to his good Friends the Rabble, that ſhe has falſified the whole Matter.

Well, we ſhall ſee what he builds upon this Foundation: Let him ſpeak for himſelf.

The way of her Satisfaction was very extraordinary; for towards the Concluſion ſhe confeſſes ſhe was not able, nor would ſhe enter into Diſputes with any body.

Commend me to him for a Man of quick diſpatch. At the firſt daſh he is bringing the two Ends of her Paper together; for he ſays, *Towards the Concluſion ſhe confeſſes.* 'Twas well ſearch'd of him, however, to hunt counter, and run to the End of her Diſcourſe for the Beginning of his own. He will loſe no Advantages,

vantages, I warrant him. Preſs that home, Doctor. She modeſtly owns, that ſhe was neither able nor willing to enter into Diſputes; therefore ſhe had no other way to ſatisfie her ſelf: When the whole driſt of this Pious and ſincere Diſcourſe is to inform her Friends of the Methods by which God Almighty brought her into his Church; her Paper being a plain and ſhort Hiſtory of her Converſion.

The Anſwerer is of Opinion, there is nothing to be done, no ſatisfaction to be had in Matters of Religion without Diſpute; that's his only Receipt, his *Noſtrum* for attaining a true belief. But Doctors differ in this Point. For another * Witty Gentleman of his Church deſir'd no other Epitaph upon his Tomb than this; *Here lies the Author of this Sentence*, Diſputandi pruritus, ſcabies Eccleſiæ— *The itch of Diſputation is the Scab or Tetter of the Church.* Now if the Learned avail themſelves ſo little of Diſpute, that it is as rare as a Prodigie for one of them to convince another, what ſhall become of the Ignorant, when they are to deal with thoſe fencers of Divinity? Who can hit them in Tierce and Quart at pleaſure, while they are ignorant how to ſtand upon their guard. And yet ſuch poor People have Souls to ſave as precious in the ſight of God as the grim *Logicians.* Muſt they be damned unleſs they can make a regular approach to Heaven, in Mood and Figure? Is there no entring there without a Sillogiſm? or Ergoteering it with a *nego, concedo, & diſtinguo?* The beſt on't is, Our Saviours Diſciples were but poor Fiſhermen, and we read but of one of his Apoſtles who was bred up at the Feet of *Gamaliel.* I would beſeech our Anſwerer to conſider whether he has argued

* Sir. Henry Wootton.

gued upon his own Principles, in affirming, that none can be satisfied as to the grounds of leaving one Church and going to the other without entring into Dispute? Has he not allow'd, that every Man is to Interpret the Scripture for himself, in reference to his own Salvation? With what Face then can he positively say, *That this Lady*, who had not only read the Scriptures, but found them in her Judgment plainly to decide the great Controversie betwixt Catholics and Protestants, *might not leave his Church, and enter into that of Christ, by Interpreting* this is my Body, *in the Litteral and Obvious meaning*? If from a Catholic she had become a Protestant by expounding those Words in a Figurative Sense, he would have applauded her for not discerning the Lords Body, and said she was in the right to Interpret for her self. But she, it seems, must be an exception to his General Rule, and not have that priviledge allow'd her which he dare not deny to any Sectary of the Nonconformists. The Phanatics think the Scripture is clear in all Matters of Salvation, and if so, what need, say they, of those Spiritual Directours? Even the Pillars of the Church by Law establish'd, from their own Concessions are found to be but broken Staffs: For after all their undertaking to heal a wounded Conscience, when the Arrows of the Almighty are stuck into it, they leave their Proselytes finally to the Scripture; as our Physicians, when they have emptied the Pockets of their Patients without curing them, send them at last to *Tunbridge Waters*, or the Air of *Montpelliers*.

But if Persons be resolv'd before hand what to do, says our Answerer, *there is no such way as to declare they will not enter into Dispute.* Here

Here he would make us believe, that ſhe ſwallow'd a new Religion without chewing it, becauſe ſhe Diſputed not, I have ſhew'd already what is the common fate of Diſputation: But had ſhe no other way of ſatisfying her Conſcience? (as he immediately infers ſhe had not.) If he were not obſtinately blind, or rather had not an intention to blind his Reader, he might have obſerv'd the Methods and Gradations of her change, and that tho' ſhe Diſputed not; yet ſhe Diſcourſed (which is entring into Matter of Diſpute) with ſome of the ableſt of the *Engliſh* Clergy, even with him particularly who was left by the Biſhop of *Wincheſter* to be her Spiritual Directour; by which it plainly appears, notwithſtanding all the jugglings and gloſſes of our Anſwerer, that the better part even of his own Preſcription was put in practice by her, though without effect, as to her ſatisfaction. Why then do's he ask ſo many idle Queſtions? *Had ſhe no Divines of the Church of* England *about her? none able and willing to afford her their utmoſt aſſiſtance*, when ſhe takes care to inform the World, that ſhe had ſuch Divines, that ſhe imparted her Scruples, and after all, remain'd unſatisfied with their Anſwers.

Perſons of Learning, indeed he ſays, *may poſſibly be ſatisfied without entring into Diſputes of Matters which ſhe had neither the leiſure to examine, nor the capacity to judge of.*

Then as I ſaid before, the Kingdom of Heaven is chiefly, if not only for the Wiſe and Learned of this World, though our Saviour was not of this Judgment. But is not every Man to be ſatisfied *pro modulo ſuo?* according to the meaſure of his own Underſtanding? Can an ignorant Perſon enter into the

the Knowledge of the Myſteries of our Faith, when even the moſt Learned cannot underſtand them? Can the Anſwerer himſelf unriddle the ſecrets of the Incarnation, ſadom the undivided Trinity? Or the Conſubſtantiality of the Eternal Son with all his Readings and Examinations? From whence comes it then that he believes them? ſince neither the Scripture is plain about them, nor the Wit of Man can comprehend them? As for her comparing the Doctrines of both Churches, no queſtion ſhe did it to the beſt of her Ability; for if he will believe her in any thing, ſhe both read the Scriptures, and conferr'd with the moſt Learned Proteſtants before ſhe had any Diſcourſes with a Catholic Prieſt: But if ſhe had not, as he rudely ſays, the capacity of judging in deep Controverſies, 'tis very probable ſhe might want that of underſtanding the inſtructions of her Guides: For if I may ſimilize in my turn, a dull fellow might ask the meaning of a Problem in Euclide from the Biſhop of *Salisbury*, without being ever the better for his Learned Solution of it: So then, her Capacity will break no ſquares, at leaſt from the Doctrine of the Engliſh Church, and the Presbyterians, put them both together as they now ſtand united; for either the Scriptures are clear, and then a mean Capacity will ſerve to underſtand them, or though they are never ſo obſcure, yet the upſhot of all is that every Man is to Interpret for himſelf.

What farther quarrel he can have againſt the Lady in this particular I know not, unleſs it be upon the Biſhop of *Wincheſters* account; namely, That ſhe refus'd to adviſe with him, and admitted the two others to a Conference, and what reaſon ſhe had for ſo doing, if I were as penetrating as my

Author

Author I ſhould undertake to demonſtrate by the Infallible Evidence of Circumſtances and Inferences; but ſince the parties are dead, and ſo long ſince, I will not give my own Opinion why ſhe refus'd him, and of what Principles ſhe might poſſibly have thought him: At preſent I will not trouble my ſelf farther with that Prelate of rich Memory, whom I warrant you our Author would not commend ſo much for his great Abilities and willingneſs to reſolve the Ladies doubts, if he had not ſome Journey-work for him to do hereafter: neither will I meddle much with the long Impertinent Story of his Letter to the Ducheſs, and her ſilence at *Farnham*, where ſhe would not conſult him in any of her doubts: Whatever great matters are made of theſe by our Anſwerer, ſhe had a very ſufficient reaſon for not asking his Advice, as will inſtantly be made appear: but now our Author is at another of his dodging tricks, comparing Times and Dates of Letters, the Biſhops bearing Date the Twenty fourth of *January*, that very Year in which ſhe chang'd; but that he may not puzzle himſelf too much in reckoning, I will unriddle the Matter of Fact to him, which I have from a moſt Authentic Hand; the Duke and Ducheſs were at *Farnham* in the beginning of *September*, where they continued about three Days, in the Year 1670. Her Highneſſes Paper bears Date the Twentieth of *Auguſt* 1670. by which it is manifeſt, that it was written twelve or fourteen Days before her viſit to the Biſhop. Now where, I beſeech you, is the wonder, that ſhe ſpoke nothing to him concerning any points of a Religion in which ſhe was already ſatisfied? Wou'd any Man ask another what's a Clock, after he had been juſt looking

upon a Sun-dial? So that all his aggravations, dwindle at length into this poor Inference, that it is evident she did not make use of the ordinary means for her own Satisfaction; at least (mark how he mollifies for fear of being trap'd) as to those Bishops who had known her longest.

Now this is so pitiful, that it requires no Answer: for it amounts to no more than that she lik'd not the Bishop, and therefore, from the beginning conceal'd her Scruples from him; and she chang'd her Religion the same Year (tho' before he writ to her) because she was satisfied of another; but do's it follow from hence, as he infers, that in the mean while she did not use the ordinary means for her satisfaction? supposing she had lik'd the other two Bishops, as little as she did him, had she no other ordinary means but by those two, or even by any other Bishops? Satisfied, to be sure, she was, or she had not chang'd; and if the means had been wholly extraordinary from the Inspirations of Gods Holy Spirit only, she had thereby receiv'd the greater favour; but not omitting to give God thanks for his Supernatural Assistance, she us'd also, the ordinary means.

It appears that her first Emotions were from her observing the Devotions of the Catholics in *France* and *Flanders*, and this is no news to any Traveller; ask even our Protestant Gentlemen at their return from Catholic Countries, and they cannot but confess, that the Exercises of their Devotion, their Mortifications, their Austerities, their Humility, their Charity, and in short, all the ways of good living are practis'd there in a far greater measure than they are in *England*: But these are the Vertues from which we are blessedly reform'd by the Example and Precept

of

of that Lean, Mortified Apoſtle, St. *Martin Luther.*

Her firſt Scruples were rais'd in her by reading Doctor *Heylins* Hiſtory of the Reformation, and what ſhe found in it we ſhall ſee hereafter; it appears, that Hiſtory had given her ſome new apprehenſions, and to ſatisfie them, ſhe conſider'd of the Matters in difference betwixt the Catholics and Proteſtants, and ſo conſidered them as to examine them the beſt ſhe could by Scripture, which ſhe found to ſpeak clearly for the Catholics, and ſhe upon our Authors Principles, was Judge of this: after which ſhe ſpoke with two of the beſt Biſhops in *England*, and their doubtful, or rather favourable Anſwers did but add more to the deſire ſhe had to be a Catholic: All theſe ordinary ways ſhe took, before ſhe could perſuade her ſelf to ſend for a Prieſt, whoſe endeavours it pleas'd the Almighty ſo to bleſs that ſhe was reconcil'd to his Church, and her troubled Conſcience was immediately at reſt.

I have been forc'd to recapitulate theſe things, and to give them the Reader at one view; for our Anſwerer is ſo cunning at his Trade, that he ſhews them only in Parcels and by Retail, that it might not be thought ſhe us'd the ordinary Means. One thing I had omitted, which was, that the Biſhop affirms in his Letter to her Highneſs, that ſhe had made him a Promiſe, in caſe any Writing were put into her Hand by thoſe of the *Roman* Church, ſhe would ſend it either to him, or the Biſhop of *Oxford.*

Why do's our Author put down that Promiſe thus at large? If he means any thing more by it, beſides a Juſtification of his Biſhop for having done his part, which ſignifies juſt nothing, he would tacitely inſinuate, that ſhe broke her Word, by not

ſending any ſuch Writing to him. If ſo, he is at his Legerdemain again. He would have it thought, ſhe kept not her Promiſe, but do's not poſitively affirm it: But ſince it is manifeſt, by the order of time in her Paper, that ſhe neither ſent for any Prieſt, nor conferr'd with any Learn'd Catholic, till after ſhe had done with the two Biſhops, it may, and ought to be ſuppos'd, that ſhe receiv'd no Writings from any of that Religion; for if ſhe had ſhe would certainly have mention'd them.

If then the Biſhop of *Wincheſter* would inſinuate, that ſhe had ſuch Papers, which ſhe ſent not to him, according to her Engagement, I may at leaſt anſwer with my Author, That the Lady was dead long before the Biſhop publiſh'd his Letter, ſo that the Circumſtances therein mention'd cannot be ſo fully clear'd.

But to return to our Anſweter: He has brought us at length to the ſeveral Diſcourſes which her Highneſs had with the two Biſhops, his Grace of *Canterbury*, and the Biſhop of *Worceſter*; and ſince he has thought fit to put all that concern'd this Matter into one long Paragraph, quoted from the Ducheſs, I muſt follow his Example. Theſe are her Words. *After this, I ſpoke ſeverally to two of the beſt Biſhops we have in* England, *who both told me, there were many things in the* Roman *Church which it were very much to be wiſh'd we had kept; as Confeſſion, which was no doubt commanded of God; that Praying for the Dead was one of the ancient things in Chriſtianity; that for their parts, they did it daily, tho' they would not own it: And afterwards preſſing one of them very much upon the other Points, he told me, That if he had been bred a Catholic, he would not change his Religion;*

ligion; but that being of another Church, wherein he was ſure were all things neceſſary to Salvation, he thought it very ill to give that Scandal, as to leave that Church wherein he had receiv'd his Baptiſm. All theſe Diſcourſes did but add more to the deſire I had to be a Catholic, and gave me the moſt terrible Agonies in the world, &c,

This, he confeſſes, *ſeems to be to the purpoſe*. And where he confeſſes the leaſt Advantage on our ſide, the Reader may ſwear there is ſomewhat more than ordinary in the matter: But he retrenches immediately, and kicks down the Pail, by adding this Reſtriction, *If there were not ſome Circumſtances and Expreſſions very much miſtaken in the Repreſentation of it.* Yet in the next Line again, as if he were aſham'd of his own fearfulneſs, he is for making a bold Sally, and putting all to the puſh: For, *ſuppoſing the utmoſt to be allow'd*, ſays he, *there could be no Argument from hence drawn for leaving the Communion of our Church:* But he reſtrains that too with this Caution, *If the Biſhops Authority and Example did ſignifie any thing with her.* Thus from yielding at firſt he comes to modifie his Conceſſion, and from thence to ſtrike out magnanimouſly.

But then he retreats again with another (*if.*) 'Tis a ſign he is uneaſie, when he toſſes and turns ſo often in a Breath; and that he is diffident of his Cauſe, when he ſhifts his Plea. 'Tis evident that the Ducheſs laid a great ſtreſs on theſe Conceſſions; and well ſhe might: for what a ſtartle would it give to a doubting Soul, which already had taken the Alarm, to hear two Biſhops, whereof one was Primate of All *England*, renouncing and condemning two of the eſtabliſh'd Articles of their Church?

But

But 'tis well known, that thoſe two Prelates were not, nor, if they were now living, would be the only Clergy-men of the Church of *England* who are of opinion they have over-reform'd themſelves, in caſting off Prayers for the Dead, and conſequently, the Doctrine of a Third Place: But theſe are Church of *England* Men of the old ſtamp, betwixt whom, and the Faction of this Anſwerer, there is juſt as much difference, as betwixt a true Epiſcopal Man, and a *Latitudinarian*: and this latter, in plain terms, is no otherwiſe different from a *Presbyterian*, than *by whatſoever Titles and Dignities he is diſtinguiſh'd.* So that our Anſwerer was much in the right, to skip over the firſt half of this Paragraph without anſwering in this place, and to gallop to the laſt Sentence of it, which begins with Biſhop *Blandford's* ſaying, That *if he had been bred in the Communion of the* Roman *Church, he would not change his Religion:* Whither, as in Duty bound, I follow him.

To over-ballance the weight of theſe Conceſſions, our Author would have us think, that the ſubſequent Words of the Biſhop ought to have had greater force to have kept her in the Communion of the Proteſtant Church, than the former to have drawn her from it; for the Biſhop comes off with this Excuſe, *That being of another Church, wherein he was ſure were all things neceſſary to Salvation, he thought it very ill to give that Scandal, as to leave that Church wherein he receiv'd his Baptiſm.*

Firſt, take notice, That the Ducheſs ſays, the Biſhop was preſſed by her very much, before he made the Conceſſion; That if he had been bred a Catholic, he would not have chang'd: Which ſhews, that a Truth was forc'd out of him, which he would willingly

willingly have conceal'd. For, both in regard to his own Credit, and the retaining of ſo Great a Perſon in his Church, it was not his Intereſt to have yielded that a Catholic might be ſaved, at leaſt on as eaſie Terms as a Proteſtant. But he goes farther, when he confeſſes, That if he had been bred a Catholic, he would not have alter'd his Religion: For therein he ſeems even to regret his being bred a Proteſtant; at leaſt he yields, that all things neceſſary to Salvation were in the *Roman* Catholic Church; for otherwiſe, had he been educated in it, he ought in conſcience to have chang'd, which he owns he would not have done. Now this is manifeſtly more than what he ſaid for the Church of *England*; for his following Words are rather an Excuſe for his Continuance in his Church, than an Argument to diſſuade her Highneſs from turning Catholic. He thought it very ill to give that Scandal to leave the Church, wherein he was Baptiz'd. Now the Word *Scandal* plainly relates to his own Perſon, and ſignifies no more, than that he was aſham'd to change: For it was impoſſible for him to think he ſhould ſin againſt his Conſcience in changing, who had declar'd, That he would not have chang'd, in caſe he had been bred a Catholic. And the Reaſon he gives is made of the ſame yielding Metal, (*viz.*) That he had his Baptiſm in the Proteſtant Church; for that Argument in it ſelf is of no weight, ſince the Right Reverend well knew, that the Baptiſm even of Heretics is good; ſo that if he had been Chriſtn'd in the *Lutheran*, the *Abyſſine*, or the *Ruſſian* Church, he muſt for that reaſon have continu'd in it: But he timerouſly pleads his fear of giving Scandal; which is, as I ſaid, no Juſtification of himſelf, no Diſſua-

ſive

ſive to Her, but only a mean, intereſſed Apology for his not changing.

As for his intimating, That all things neceſſary to Salvation were to be had in the Church of *England*, let any reaſonable Man be Judge, whether he could poſſibly have ſaid leſs in defence of himſelf, for continuing in it; For this only ſhew'd, that he thought Salvation was to be had in both Churches, as even this Author himſelf is forc'd to confeſs afterwards, in theſe words: *The utmoſt that can be made of this, is, That a certain Biſhop of our Church* (who in the mean time has prov'd himſelf an uncertain one) *held both Churches ſo far Parts of the Catholic Church, that there was no neceſſity of going from one Church to another.*

That which he calls the utmoſt we can make of it, is in truth the leaſt which the Biſhop's Words will naturally bear; and I may ſafely put the Cauſe upon this Iſſue, Whether ſuch a Diſcourſe might not reaſonably add more to the deſire ſhe had to be a Catholic?

Let us hear now what he has to anſwer; and I will reply briefly, becauſe I have taken away the Strength of his Argument already.

Firſt, He ſays in effect, That the Biſhops Authority and Example ought to have prevail'd with her on the one ſide, more than his Conceſſions on the other.

I reply; Not his Authority, becauſe he ſpoke more for the Church of *Rome*, than againſt it: Nor his Example; for he gave her no encouragement to follow it, by ſaying, That if he had been bred a Catholic, he would not have chang'd. His Example of Praying daily for the Dead, ſhew'd his Opi-

nion

nion at the bottom; but his not publicly owning that he did ſo, has prov'd him little better than a Black Biſhop, who was enter'd privately into the White ones Walk.

Our Author asks in the ſecond place, Why any Perſon ſhould forſake the Communion of the Proteſtant Church, wherein the Biſhop affirm'd were all things neceſſary to Salvation? And I enquire, How ſhe could be bound to believe him, ſince Confeſſion, and Prayers for the Dead are wanting in it; one of which he had before acknowledg'd to be commanded of God; the other, to be one of the ancient things in Chriſtianity?

Thirdly, He urges, That the Biſhop had told her it was an ill thing to leave the Church of *England*. And I reply, That the Anſwerer has falſified his Words. *The Biſhop only thought it very ill to give that Scandal, as to leave the Church wherein he was Baptiz'd.* Firſt, he ſpoke of himſelf only, not of her. Mark that Fallacy. And then he ſaid not, It was ill to leave the Church; but, very ill to give that Scandal, as to leave the Church; relating again to his own particular.

Fourthly, He ſays, 'Tis evident that the Biſhops Conceſſions could have no influence upon her (tho' ſhe poſitively ſays, thoſe Diſcourſes, in which were thoſe Conceſſions, did but add more to the deſire ſhe had to be a Catholic.) This is full upon the Vizor; but the Dead are to take all things patiently. Well! How if he can convince her of Falſity from her own Words? Why, then he will carry his Argument, as well as his Good Manners, to the height; and how broad ſoever the Word may be which he has ſlily given her, yet he will tell you, That Free-

dom ought to be permitted him, as ſuſtaining the Honour of the Church of *England*.

His Argument is this: *She declares afterwards, That ſhe would not have chang'd, if ſhe had thought it poſſible otherwiſe to have ſaved her Soul: But the Biſhop had told her, That all things neceſſary for Salvation were in the* Engliſh *Church: Therefore the Biſhop contributed nothing to her Change.*

So the Miter be ſafe in its Reputation, no matter what becomes of the Ducal Coronet. Now I can be very well content that the Biſhop ſhould have no part in the Honour of her Converſion; for, 'tis plain, that he deſir'd it not: and why ſhould he do good againſt his will?

I wiſh my Author would have furniſh'd me with an Argument to have brought him wholly off; but I will bring him on his way as far as by the help of the Anſwerer's Scarf I can fairly drag him. I ſay therefore, That tho' her Highneſs chang'd not her Belief upon the Conceſſions of the Biſhop, yet his Conceſſions were an occaſion of her farther Scruples, in order to her Change: For, ſhe ſays, *they added to the deſire ſhe had to be a Catholic.*

The Biſhop did indeed tell her, That all things neceſſary to Salvation were in the *Engliſh* Church; but tell me, Sir, I beſeech you, was that all he told her? By your favour, you have left out the better half of what he ſaid: for he told her alſo, That *if he had been bred a Catholic, he would not have chang'd.* And ſhe had reaſon to believe what he ſaid to the advantage of a Church of which he was no Member, as being ſure he would ſay no more than ſcanty Truth. And he acknowledges into the Bargain, That *Confeſſion was commanded of God*; and, that

Praying

Praying for the Dead was one of the ancient things in Chriſtianity. What a ſhameful way of arguing is this, to make a general Negative Concluſion from half the Premiſes? Or, in other Words, to maintain that the Biſhops Conceſſions could have no influence upon her, becauſe they had not the greateſt influence? And you in a manner confeſs it before you were aware, in the cloſe of your Argument, where you ſay, *There muſt therefore have been ſome more ſecret Reaſon, which increas'd her deſire to be a Catholic after theſe Diſcourſes.* Now ſome more ſecret Reaſon do's not hinder the Biſhops Conceſſions from being one; nay, it argues, that they were one of the Reaſons, though not the moſt prevalent, becauſe there was one more ſecret. You have now contradicted your ſelf ſo plainly, that you have wholly juſtified the Ducheſs, and the broad Word, without naming it, is fairly brought back to your own door.

After this, our Anſwerer do's but piddle, and play at ſmall Game, as if her Highneſs might poſſibly take encouragement from the Biſhop's calling the Church of *Rome* the Catholic Religion: But ſhe was too much in earneſt to lay hold upon a Word. Neither is more advantage to be taken from his calling the Church of *Rome* the Catholic Religion, than we receive diſadvantage from the playing upon the Word of *Roman Catholic.*

Next, for want of a Quarrel, he is falling on his late dear Friend the Biſhop: *Was he*, ſays our Anſwerer, *ſo weak, to mean the Word* Catholic *in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, he muſt then have contradicted himſelf, there was an inconſiſtency in his Words*, and ſo forth.

From the inconſiſtency of the Biſhop's Words, in this and other Places, our Anſwerer, perhaps, would

make a ſecret Inference, That he never ſaid them; and obliquely draw the Ducheſs into the Statute of Coining: So that the two Spiritual Hectors may make a Sham-duel of it, for ought we know. For 'tis a common trick with Robbers to claſh their Swords together in the dark, to draw Company together, and then ſome third Perſon pays for it. Take it in this manner, and then the Argument againſt her Highneſs will ſtand thus: The Sayings which ſhe relates are inconſiſtent, and therefore ſhe muſt not be believ'd, though ſhe affirms ſhe heard them. Why, do not as many as have Ears hear inconſiſtent things ſaid every day? and muſt every body needs lie who reports them again? That Inconſiſtency of the Words is, in truth, an Argument that the things were ſaid: For what bids fairer for adding to the deſire ſhe had of being a Catholic, and of giving her the terrible Agonies ſhe felt? But after all, if the Anſwerer's Quarrel be in earneſt with the Biſhop, 'tis pity they ſhould fall out for ſuch a Trifle: As weak as the Biſhop was, and as ſtrong as our Anſwerer makes his Inconſiſtencies appear, I dare anſwer for him, he meant nothing leſs than to convert her.

You do ill therefore to play the Bully with a peaceable Old Gentleman, who only deſir'd to poſſeſs his Conſcience and his Biſhopric in peace, without offence to any Man, either of the Catholic Church, or that of *England*.

But if he held, that both Churches were ſo far Parts of the Catholic, that there was no neceſſity of going from one Church to another to be ſav'd if he aſſerted that you ſay, he muſt overthrow the Neceſſity of your Reformation; and then down go's his Belief of your Homilies and Articles (Thirty nine

at

at a Tip, and consequently he could be no true Member of the Church of *England.*

And now what can I do more for the poor Bishop? For most certainly he did imply thus much in saying, That *if he had been bred a Catholic, he would not change his Religion.* Therefore, Take him *Topham*; there's no help, but he must be turn'd out of the Church of *England*, even so long after he has been dead.

In the mean time, let us a little examine this Proposition. Our Answerer affirms, *That he cannot be a true Member of the Church of* England, *who asserts both Churches to be so far Parts of the Catholic Church, that there is no necessity of going from one Church to another to be sav'd.* If this be true, then, to be a Member of the Church of *England*, one must assert, That either both Churches are not Parts of the Catholic, or, That they are so Parts, that there is a necessity of going from one to another. Of these two, the first is not for the Honour of one of the Churches, and the second is direct Nonsence. A Necessity of Change consists not with their being both Parts; for Parts constitute one Whole, and leave not one and another, to go to or from. There is no Church in *France* or *Italy*, to which a *Spanish* Catholic can go, but what he left in *Spain*; nor can he leave his own, by going to either of them. He may be under other Governours in the same Church; but let him go whereſoever he shall please, he cannot be of another, so long as he remains a Catholic. In short, Necessity of Change makes it absolutely impossible for both Churches to be Parts of the Catholic, and forces the Church of *England* to maintain, either that she is a Part, and the *Roman* Catholic none; or else, that 'tis no matter whether she be a

Part

Part or no; to which, I wiſh, they may not, with the Pretence of Zeal for her Honour, deſire to drive her, who have nothing better to ſay in their own behalf.

But though our Anſwerer has laid one Biſhop flat, I warrant you he has another in reſerve: For now the Biſhop of *Wincheſter* (who, as I ſaid formerly, was not commended ſo much for nothing) is brought back in Triumph from his Palace of *Farnham*, to make a ſhort end of the Diſpute. At firſt he doubts, whether ever there were any ſuch Biſhops who made ſuch Anſwers; and then affirms, that he believes there never was *in rerum naturâ* ſuch a Diſcourſe as is pretended to have been betwixt this Great Perſon, and two of the moſt Learned Biſhops in *England*.

This is downright indeed; for our Anſwerer, to do him Juſtice, has *often* collaterally accus'd the Ducheſs for her good Invention at making Stories: but here is plain *Engliſh* upon the Point. What pity is it in the mean time, that my Lord of *Winton* gives not ſo much as one ſingle Reaſon either for his Doubt, or his contrary Belief? So that having only his Lordſhip's *Opinion*, and her Highneſs's Affirmation before me, I might ſay, with at leaſt as much Good Manners as that Prelate, That I believe as little of his pretended Letter ſent to the Ducheſs ſo long after her Deceaſe, as he do's of her pretended Diſcourſe with the two Biſhops.

In the mean time, what uſe would my Gentleman here make of his Lordſhips doubts, his belief, or his affirmation? Are the Embers too hot for him, that he uſes the Biſhops Foot to pull out the Cheſnut? Suppoſe our Prelate had believ'd there were no Antiphodes, is this a time of Day to give him credit? But I wonder the leſs, why our Author attributes

butes ſo much to his *ipſe dixit* upon all occaſions; for the whole body of his Anſwer, to this Paper, is in effect a Tranſcript from the Biſhops Preface: He purloyns his Arguments, without altering, ſometime, ſo much as the property of his words. He has quoted him five times only in the Margent, and ought to have quoted him in almoſt every line of his Pamphlet. In ſhort, if the Maſter had not eaten, the Man (ſaving Reverence) could not have vomited. But it is eaſie to be ſeen through all the grimaces of that Biſhop, that he found himſelf aggriev'd, he has not thought on, when her Highneſs ſpoke of the two beſt, or moſt Learned Biſhops of *England*; and that his Opinion was not conſulted, when, indeed, he had offer'd it, though unask'd.

I know his Defender will reply, That his Lordſhip has modeſtly diſclaim'd any ſuch Pretence to Learning, in his Preface, where he ſays, *No, I am not, I know I am not, I am ſure I am not the moſt Learned Biſhop.* See how he mounts in his Expreſſions at three ſeveral Bounds. 'Tis true, all theſe Aſſeverations, like his three *Nolo*'s, needed not; for any reaſonable Man, who had read his Works, would have taken his bare word, without Repetition. Yet this notwithſtanding, he might have ſome inward grudgings, that his Pupil thought him not ſo great a Doctor.

But it is not fit that a Matter of ſuch importance ſhould end in a bare *Ay* and *No* on either ſide; for though the Parties have been ſo long dead, yet there is a Witneſs ſtill alive, and ſuch a one, that all Loyal Subjects are bound to joyn with me in Prayers for the long continuance of His Life, and even for His continuance in the True Religion, as far as the *Engliſh* Liturgy can oblige them.

The

The Dutchess thought her self bound to make his Royal Highness acquainted with every one of these several Conferences, which she had either with Archbishop *Sheldon*, or Bishop *Blandford*, and that account was the very same in substance with what she communicates to her Friends in this present Paper, as he is pleas'd to permit me to assure the World after having had the Honour to hear him solemnly affirm it which puts an end to the whole Matter of Dispute, and this which follows is as Authentic.

The Day it pleased Almighty God to call her Highness to his Mercy, some Relations of hers, who are yet living, were desirous that she should speak with the Bishop of *Worcester*; which the Dutchess did not absolutely refuse upon their importunity; but requested the then Duke to stop the Bishop a little in the Anti-chamber and prepare him, according to her directions, before he enter'd the Bed-chamber: accordingly His Highness having met the Bishop acquainted him, *That she was actually reconcil'd to the Catholic Church*; he then enquir'd, *Whether she were fully satisfied in all Points of the Doctrine which she had embrac'd*; and the Duke answer'd, *that she was entirely satisfied in the Doctrine of the Catholic Church*; at length the Bishop ask'd, *Whether she had already receiv'd the last Sacraments of the Church, naming particularly those of the Blessed Eucharist, and the Extreme Unction*; and it being reply'd by the Duke that she had receiv'd them, the Bishop answered, *That than he doubted not but that her Soul was in a very safe condition*; before they parted, His Royal Highness told him, *That it was the desire of the Dutchess, he would not trouble her with any Matter of Dispute,*

Diſpute, nor offer to Pray with her, but if he had any Spiritual Counſel fitting for a Perſon in her condition, in order to prepare her for her Death, he might freely tender it; upon this he was admitted to her Bedchamber, and made her a brief Exhortation; after which, his ſtay there was very ſhort.

This being matter of Fact, and of unqueſtionable Truth, I hope the Anſwerer will acquieſce in it, What he will think of his Biſhop concerns not me, but as a Proteſtant he has reaſon for his thanking God, that the Cauſe of his Church do's not depend on the ſingular Opinion of one Biſhop in it. It appears plainly by this Relation, that the Biſhop of *Worceſter* was ignorant, almoſt to the laſt, of her Converſion; ſo that, if that will ſerve our Authors turn, he is acquitted from intending any ſuch Act of Charity, but that he contributed to it without any ſuch intention is apparent.

Yet our Author will not ſo ſit down; he will condemn her Highneſs from her own words again; and prove from her ſaying, *that ſhe ow'd the Bleſſing of her Converſion to God Almighty*, that therefore the Biſhop could have no hand in it.

What obligation has he to defend the Honour of his Church by a piece of Sophiſtry? She ow'd it wholly to Almighty God; *for of our ſelves we can do nothing:* but as the Anſwerer confeſſes this excluded not her own endeavours; God inſpir'd her with a deſire of being reconcil'd to his Church, in anſwer to her frequent Prayers, not by immediate illumination, or ſhewing her the right belief miraculouſly, but by affording her the ordinary means, and conducting her by his good Spirit in the uſe of them: If ſhe had been immediately enlightn'd ſhe needed not

to have recourſe to any of the Biſhops, but it pleas'd God, who often works Good out of Evil, that the Arguments they us'd, or rather, the Anſwers which they made, produc'd a contrary effect, and added more to the deſire ſhe had to be a Catholic; in this ſenſe, therefore it may be ſaid, that the Biſhops ſent her to the Prieſt; for an unreſiſtable, over-ruling Power, made them contribute to her change by oppoſing it; and the very hands which labour'd to hold her faſt in the Proteſtant Perſwaſion, carried her half Seas over, and put her into other Hands, which carried her the other half. Truly they would have receiv'd hard meaſure, if they had been found guilty on the Statute of Perſwaſion, who far from endeavouring to make her change, diſſwaded her from changing, tho' the Proteſtant Flints happen'd to ſtrike Catholic Fire: So that I cannot but think there was an extraordinary Hand of Providence in her Caſe; and of which ſhe had reaſon to be extraordinary ſenſible. But we muſt have, I perceive, a care of Praying, and owning benefits from God; for that, or nothing made her paſs for an Enthuſiaſt with the Anſwerer: She did nothing beſides Praying, which our Author do's not acknowledge it her duty to have done. She read the Hiſtory which was put into her Hands, to confirm her in her firſt belief; ſhe examin'd the Scripture, ſhe conferr'd with her Divines; and yet he can make an obſtinate Woman of her for doing that very thing, to which he wou'd adviſe her. *But*, ſays our Author, *All pretenders to Enthuſiaſm do as ſolemnly and wholly aſcribe the Bleſſing to Almighty God, and look on it as the effect of ſuch Prayers, as ſhe made to him in* France *and* Flanders.

They aſcribe it indeed wholly to God in our Authors

thors Senſe, but not in hers; for ſhe meant not immediate illumination by the word *wholly*, as I have already prov'd; they may look on their falſe light, as the effect of their Prayers, but ſhe looks on her Converſion as the effect of hers, after having uſed the means.

He had thought, he ſays, *that the pretence to a private Spirit, or Enthuſiaſm (for he joyns them both afterwards) had not been at this time allowed in the Church of* Rome.

Somebody once thought otherwiſe, or he had never diverted the young Gallants of the Town, with his merry Book concerning the Fanaticiſm of the Church of *Rome*.

He next enquires what need ſhe had of an infallible Church, if ſhe owed her Change ſo wholly to Almighty God?

Wholly is already explain'd to him, and then his Argument is of no more force againſt her, then againſt all Catholics who have once been Proteſtants; which is a new Subject of Diſpute, and forrein to the Argugument in hand.

Her Concluſion, as he tells us, *is, That ſhe would never have chang'd, if ſhe could have ſav'd her Soul otherwiſe*; Whereupon he infers, *If this were true, ſhe had good reaſon for her change; if it were not true (as moſt certainly it was not) ſhe had none.*

But her words (which he hath falſifi'd in this place) are theſe, *I would never have chang'd, if I had thought it poſſible to have ſav'd my Soul otherwiſe.* He never miſquotes without deſign. Now by altering theſe words, *If I had thought it poſſible to ſave my Soul*, into theſe, *If I could have ſav'd my Soul*, he would ſhuffle off her true meaning; which was, That her Conſcience oblig'd

her to this change. And that's a Point he would not willingly have touch'd: for he cannot deny upon his own Principles, but that after having examin'd the Scriptures, as ſhe profeſſes to have done as well as ſhe was able, concerning the Points in diſpute, and afterwards uſing the aſſiſtance of her Spiritual Guides, the two Biſhops, ſhe was to judge for her ſelf, in the laſt reſort; and the Judgment ſhe made according to her Conſcience, was, That the Scripture ſpoke clearly in behalf of the Catholic Church, (or Church of *Rome*, as he calls it:) Therefore according to his Principles, and her Conſcience, ſhe was to be of that Church, of whoſe Truth ſhe was thus convinc'd; ſo that whether ſhe could be otherwiſe ſav'd or no, was not the Propoſition to be advanc'd, but whether ſhe thought it poſſible to be otherwiſe ſav'd. And therefore though it were true, that ſhe could otherwiſe be ſav'd, yet ſhe had a ſufficient reaſon for her change (though he ſays ſhe had none) which was her Conſcience; and ſuppoſing that were erroneous, yet upon his Principles ſhe muſt be the Judge of it without appeal.

Her Scruples began upon reading Dr. Heylin's *Hiſtory of the* Reformation; *and there ſhe found ſuch abominable Sacriledge upon* Harry *the Eighth's Divorce, King* Edward's *Minority, and Queen* Elizabeths *Succeſſion, that ſhe could not believe the Holy Ghoſt could ever be in ſuch Councils.* Thus he compendiouſly quotes her Paper, as being it ſeems aſham'd of the Particulars therein mention'd; but for once I will follow him his own way.

To read Dr. *Heylin's* Hiſtory in order to ſettle her, he confeſſes, was none of the beſt Advices given to ſuch a Perſon. He is much in the right on't, as appears

by

by the ſucceſs; and I add, nor any other, either Proteſtant or Catholic Writer then extant: for no Paint is capable of making lovely the hideous Face of the pretended Reformation. *But*, ſays he, *there are two diſtinct Parts in the Hiſtory of it, the one Eccleſiaſtical, the other Political; the firſt built on Scripture, Antiquity, and the Rights of particular Churches; the other on ſuch Maxims as are common to Stateſmen at all Times, and in all Churches, who labour to turn all Revolutions and Changes to their own Advantage.*

But why might not her Highneſs conſider it her own way, which is that of Nature, in the Cauſes which produc'd it, and the Effects which it produc'd; though I doubt not but ſhe conſider'd it his way too, becauſe a Child could not have miſt it, that very Diſtinction being inſerted into the Hiſtory by the Author himſelf. Now the immediate Cauſe which produc'd the Separation of *Harry* the Eighth from the Church of *Rome*, was the refuſal of the Pope to grant him a Divorce from his firſt Wife, and to gratifie his Deſires in a Diſpenſation for a ſecond Marriage. Neither the Anſwerer, nor I, nor any Man, can carry it ſo high as the original Cauſe with any certainty: for the King only knew whether it was Conſcience and Love, or Love alone, which mov'd him to ſue for a Divorce: But this we may ſay, that if Conſcience had any part in it, ſhe had taken a long Nap of almoſt Twenty years together before ſhe awaken'd, and perhaps had ſlept on till Doomſday, if *Anne Bullen*, or ſome other fair Lady, had not given her a Jog; ſo the ſatisfying of an inordinate and a brutal Paſſion cannot be deny'd to have had a great ſhare at leaſt, in the production of that Schiſm which led the very way to our pretended *Reformation*: for breaking the

Unity

Unity of *Christ*'s Church was the Foundation of it.

I pass over the manner of those first Proceedings, and the Degrees by which they came to terminate in Schism, though I doubt not but her Highness was sufficiently scandaliz'd in both, and could not also but observe some of the concomitant Causes, as Revenge, Ambition, and Covetousness; all which, and others, drew with a strong Bias towards it. But the immediate Effects even of this Schism, were Sacriledge, and a bloody Persecution of such as deny'd the King's Supremacy in Matters wholly Spiritual, which no Layman, no King of *Israel* ever Exercis'd, as is observ'd by my Lord *Herbert*. As for the *Reformation* it self, what that produc'd is full as obvious in the Sequel of History, where we find, that Chanteries and Hospitals undevour'd by *Henry* the Eighth, were left only to be Morsels for *Edward* the Sixth, or rather for his Ministers of State; and the Reason was given, That the Revenues of them were fruitlesly spent on those who said Prayers for the Dead. Now this was as naturally produc'd from the *Reformation*, as an Effect is from the Cause; so that as it is observ'd by some, had that young King Reign'd any considerable time longer, the Church of *England* had been left the poorest of any one in Christendom; the rich Bishoprick of *Duresme* having been much retrench'd by him, and 'tis probable those of *Rochester* and *Westminster*. *Harry* the Eighth had indeed eaten so much of the Churches Bread out of his Son's Mouth beforehand, that even *Calvin* complains of it in a Letter to *Cranmer*, (concerning the paucity of good Pastors in *England*) in these words: *Unum apertum obstaculum esse intelligo quod prædæ expositi sunt Ecclesiæ redditus*; *One open obstacle I find to this*, (he meaneth

Herbert Hen 8. pag. 402.

meaneth the increaſe of good Paſtors) *is, That your Church Revenues are expos'd to Rapine.*

Beſides theſe things, what an Uſurpation this change of Religion caus'd, is moſt notorious; that of the Lady *Jane Gray* being evidently grounded on the Teſtament of *Edward* the Sixth, by which ſhe was made his Succeſſor, becauſe ſhe was of the Proteſtant Religion.

As for the Title of Queen *Elizabeth* to the Crown, the Hiſtories lie open, and I ſhall not be over forward to meddle with the Rights of Princes, eſpecially ſince the Anſwerer has avoided that Diſpute. 'Tis enough in general to ſay, that her Intereſt carry'd her againſt the Pope, whoſe Power, if good, ſhe was Illegitimate: She had alſo been inform'd by the *Engliſh* Reſident at *Rome*, that the Pope expected ſhe ſhou'd acknowledge her Crown from him, and not take upon her to be Queen without his leave. Theſe were ſtrong Solicitations in a new unſettled Succeſſion, for her to ſhake off a Religion, whereof his Holineſs is Head on Earth. What matter of Conſcience was in the caſe, I ſay not, but her Temporal Intereſt lies bare-fac'd and uppermoſt to view, in reaſſuming of the Supremacy, and (to make the Breach yet wider) in ſubverting the Foundations of the Faith. For the Affront is the ſame to turn round a mans Hat, and to ſtrike him on the Face; but the advantage is the greater in a luſty Blow.

But the Handle by which our Anſwerer would have the *Reformation* taken, is not by the Cauſes and Effects, the Means and Management, and indeed the whole Series of Hiſtory; theſe are nothing to concern his preſent Enquiry, though they rais'd ſuch Scruples in the Ducheſs, and will do in any other conſcientious

conſcientious Reader; he will have the *Reformation* conſider'd his own way, that is, in the Political part of it, and the Eccleſiaſtical. Now the Political part (if you obſerve him) he gives for gone at the firſt daſh; *It was grounded* (he ſays) *on ſuch Maxims as are common to Stateſmen at all Times, and in all Churches, who labour to turn all Revolutions and Changes to their own Advantage.*

That is, 'tis common for Stateſmen to be Atheiſts at the bottom; To be ſeemingly of that Religion which is moſt for their Intereſt; To cruſh and ruine that from which they have no future proſpect of Advantage, and to joyn with its moſt inveterate Enemies, without conſideration of their King's Intereſt; and this was the Caſe of the Duke of *Somerſet*. All which together amounts to this, That 'tis no matter by what Means a *Reformation* be compaſs'd, by what Inſtruments it be brought to paſs, or with what Deſign, though all theſe be never ſo ungodly, 'tis enough if the *Reformation* it ſelf be made by the Legiſlative Power of the Land. The matter of Fact then is given up, only 'tis fac'd with Recriminations; That *Alexander* the Sixth (for example) was as wicked a Pope as King *Henry* was a King: As if any Catholic deny'd that God Almighty, for Cauſes beſt known to his Divine Wiſdom, has not ſometimes permitted impious Men to ſit in that ſupream Seat, and even to intrude into it by unlawful Means. That *Alexander* the Sixth was one of the worſt of Men, I freely grant, which is more then I can in Conſcience ſay of *Henry* the Eighth, who had great and Kingly Vertues mingled with his Vices. That the Duke of *Somerſet* rais'd his Eſtate out of Church Lands, our Author excuſes no other ways than by retorting, that

Popes

Popes are accuſtom'd to do the like in conſideration of their Nephews, whom they would greaten. But though 'tis a wicked thing for a Pope to miſpend the Church Revenues on his Relations, 'tis to be conſider'd he is a Secular Prince, and may as lawfully give out of his Temporal Incomes what he pleaſes to his Favourite, as another Prince to his. But as our Author charges this Miſcarriage home upon ſome late Popes of the former, and the preſent Age; ſo I hope he will exempt his preſent Holineſs from that Note. No Common Father of God's Church, from St. *Peter* even to him, having ever been more bountiful, in expending his Revenues for the Defence of *Chriſtendom*; or leſs intereſſed, in reſpect of his Relations, whom he has neither greatn'd, nor ſo much as ſuffer'd to enter into the leaſt Adminiſtration of the Government.

But, after all, what have theſe Examples to do with this Ladies Converſion? Why, our Author pretends that theſe bad Popes, and their ill Proceedings, ought as reaſonably to have hindred the Ducheſs from entring into the Catholic Church, as the like Proceedings under *Henry* the Eighth, *Edward* the Sixth, and Queen *Elizabeth*, might move her Highneſs to leave the Proteſtant.

The Subject in hand was the Pretended Reformation; The Ducheſs obſerv'd the ſcandalous and abominable Effects of it; that an inordinate Luſt was one principal Cauſe of the Separation; that the Reformation it ſelf was begun by worldly Intereſts in the Duke of *Somerſet*, and carried on by the Ambition of Queen *Elizabeth*. Have the Examples produc'd by our Author on the contrary ſide any thing to do with a Reformation? Suppoſe in

the firſt place, that ſhe had never read nor heard any of thoſe things concerning Pope *Alexander*, or the advancing of Nephews by profuſion of the Church-Treaſure; the firſt is very poſſible, and ſhe might interpret candidly the latter. But make the worſt of it; on the one ſide there was only a Male-adminiſtration of a ſettled Government, from which no State, either Spiritual or Temporal, can always be exempt; on the other ſide, here is a total Subverſion of the Old Church in *England*, and the ſetting up a New; a changing of receiv'd Doctrines, and the Direction of God's Holy Spirit pretended for the Change; ſo that ſhe might reaſonably judge, that the Holy Ghoſt had little to do with the Practices of ill Popes, without thinking the worſe of the Eſtabliſh'd Faith: but ſhe could never ſee a new one erected on the Foundations of Luſt, Sacrilege, and Uſurpation, without great Scruples whether the Spirit of God were aſſiſting in thoſe Councils.

As for his Method of Enquiry, *Whether there was not a ſufficient Cauſe for the Reformation in the Church? Whether the Church of* England *had not ſufficient Authority to reform it ſelf?* and, *Whether the Proceedings of the Reformation were not juſtifiable by the Rules of Scripture and the Ancient Church?* I may ſafely joyn Iſſue with him upon all three Points, and conclude in the Negative. That there was no ſufficient Cauſe to reform the Church in Matters of Faith, becauſe there neither were, nor can be, any ſuch Errours embrac'd and own'd by it. The Church of *England* has no Authority of Reforming her ſelf, becauſe the Doctrine of Chriſt cannot be reformed, nor a National Synod lawfully make any Definitions in Matters of Faith, contrary to the Judgment

of

of the Church Univerſal of the preſent Age, ſhewn in her Public Liturgies; that Judgment being equivalent to that of a General Council of the preſent Age. And for the third Point, The Proceedings of the Reformation were not juſtifiable by the Rule of Scripture, according to the right Interpretation of it by the Fathers and Councils, which are the true Judges of it; nor, conſequently, by the Rules of the Ancient Church. But *Calvin*'s Excuſe muſt be your laſt Refuge, *Nos diſceſſionem a toto mundo facere coacti ſumus: We are compell'd to forſake the Communion, or to ſeparate from all the Churches of the World.*

Theſe (ſays our Author) *ſhe confeſſes were but Scruples.* According to his mannerly way of arguing with the King, I might ask him, *Theſe what*? Do's he mean, theſe Scruples were but Scruples? For the Word (*theſe*) begins a Paragraph. But I am aſham'd of playing the Pedant, as he has done. I ſuppoſe he means theſe Paſſages of *Heylyn* only rais'd ſome Scruples in her, which occaſion'd her to examine the Points in difference by the Holy Scripture. *And now* (ſays he) *ſhe was in the right way for Satisfaction, provided ſhe made uſe of the beſt Helps and Means for underſtanding it, and took in the Aſſiſtance of her Spiritual Guides.*

That ſhe did take in thoſe Guides, is manifeſt by her own Papers; though both of them (the more the pity) did but help to miſlead her into the Enemies Country: But then, for our comfort, neither of them were true Church of *England* Men, though they were both Biſhops, and one of them no leſs than Primate of All *England.*

And now for a reliſhing bit before we riſe, he has kept in ſtore for us, the four Points, which about the midſt of her Paper, the Ducheſs told us, ſhe found ſo eaſie in the Scripture, that ſhe wondered ſhe had been ſo long without finding them. He will needs fall into Diſpute with her about them, tho he knows before hand, that ſhe will not Diſpute with him. This is a kind of Petition to her, that ſhe will permit him to make that difficult, which ſhe found eaſie: for every thing becomes hard by chopping Logic upon it. I am ſure enough, that the Wall before me is White, and that I can go to it: but put me once upon unriddling Sophiſms, I ſhall not be ſatisfied of what colour the Wall is, nor how 'tis poſſible for me to ſtir from the place in which I am. Alas, if People would be as much in earneſt as ſhe was, and read the Scriptures with the ſame diſpoſition, the ſame unprejudic'd ſincerity in their Hearts, and docility in their Underſtanding, ſeeking to bend their Judgments to what they find, not what they find to their Judgments, more I believe would find things as eaſie as ſhe did, and give the Anſwerer more frequent occaſion for his deriſion of a willing mind.

But not to dilate on that matter, I preſume he will not pretend by his Diſputing, to make any thing plainly appear againſt her: If he can, let him do it, and end Controverſie in a moment; for every one can ſee plain things, and all Chriſtians muſt be concluded by the Scripture. But he knows well enough there is no ſuch thing to be perform'd. A Miſt may be raiſed, and interpoſed, through which the Eye ſhall not diſcern what otherwiſe it would, if nothing but the due medium were betwixt, and the

the Object before it. And that is all the fruit of this ſort of Diſputation, and all the Aſſiſtance, for which the Anſwerer was ſo earneſt. Upon the whole, his mortal quarrel to the Ducheſs, is, that ſhe would not become an Experiment of the perfection to which the Art of Learned Obſcurity is improv'd in this our Age. And the Honour he has done to the Church of *England*, is, that he has us'd her Name to countenance the Defamation of a Lady, I ſuſpected whether he would bring it, when I ſaw that Honour pretended, in the beginning of his Pamphlet: If he thinks his Biſhops have reflected a Scandal on his Church by their Diſcourſes with the Ducheſs, he ought to have proceeded a more reaſonable way, than to inſinuate that ſhe forg'd them, witout proving it. If ſhe had been living, and he had ſubſcrib'd his Name to ſo infamous a Libell, he knows the Engliſh of a *Scandalum Magnatum*; for an *Innuendo* is conſidered in that caſe: and three indirect inſinuations, will go as far in Law, towards the giving a downright Lie, as three Foils will go towards a Fall in Wraſtling.

To Conclude, I leave it to the Judgment of the Impartial Reader, what occaſion our Anſwerer has had for his Song of Triumph at the end of his Scurrilous, Sawcy Pamphlet; I have treated him as one ſingle Anſwerer, tho' properly ſpeaking his Name is *Legion*; but tho the Body be poſſeſſed with many evil Spirits, 'tis but one of them who talks; let him diſguiſe his defeat by the ringing of his Bells: 'Twas an old *Dutch* Pollicy when the Duke had beaten them to make Bonfires, for that kept the Populace in Heart. Our Author knows he has all the Common People on his ſide, and they only

read

read the *Gazetts* of their own Writers; ſo that every thing which is called an Anſwer is with them a Confutation, and the Turk and Pope are their Sworn Enemies ever ſince *Robin Wiſdom* was Inſpir'd to joyn 'em together in a Godly Ballad: In the mean time the Spirit of Meekneſs and Humble Charity would become our Author better than his boaſts for this imaginary Victory, or his Reflections upon Gods Anointed; but it is the leſs to be admir'd that he is ſuch a Stranger to that Spirit, becauſe, among all the Volumes of Divinity written by the Proteſtants, there is not one Original Treatiſe, at leaſt, that I have ſeen, or heard of, which has handled diſtinctly and by it ſelf, that Chriſtian Vertue of Humility.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAge 25. l. 24. for, *not the* read, not of the. p. 39. l. 7. *it will be, r.* it be p. 79 l. 1. *bare* r. bear. p. 81. l. 17. for *vibſily* r. viſibly. p. 98. l. 22. *that* r. his. p. 111. l. 11 *has* r, was. p. 113. l. 22, *Converſion to* r. Converſion wholly to.

A Catalogue of Books Printed for *Henry Hills*, Printer to the King's moſt Excellent Majeſty, for his Houſhold and Chappel, 1686. And are to be Sold next door to his Houſe in *Black-fryers*, at *Richard Cheeſe*'s.

REflections upon the Anſwer to the *Papiſt Miſ-repreſented*, &c. *Quarto.* Price ſtitch'd 2 *d.*

Papiſts Proteſting againſt *Proteſtant-Popery. Quarto.* Price ſtitch'd 4 *d.* .2 *q.*

Copies of Two Papers Written by the late King *Charles* II. Together with a Paper Written by the late Dutcheſs of *York. Folio.* Price 2 *d.*

The Spirit of Chriſtianity. *Twelves.* Price bound 9 *d.* in Quires 7 *d.*

Six Sermons Preach'd before their Majeſties in *Engliſh*, by the Reverend Father *Dom. Ph. Ellis*, Monk of the Holy Order of St. *Benedict*, and of the *Engliſh* Congregation. Chapin Ordinary to His Majeſty *Quarto.* Price ſtitch'd 2 *s.* 3 *d.*

An Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church in Matters of Controverſie. By the Right Reverend *James Benigne Boſſuet*, Counſellor to the King, Biſhop of *Meaux*, formerly of *Condom.* Done into *Engliſh* with all the former Approbations, and others newly Publiſh'd in the Ninth and Laſt Editions of the *French. Quarto.* Price ſtitch'd 9 *d.*

A Sermon Preach'd before the King and Queen, in Their Majeſties Chappel at St. *James*'s, upon the *Annunciation* of our Bleſſed Lady, *March* 25. 1686. By *Jo. Betham* Doctor of *Sorbon. Quarto.* Price ſtitch'd 4 *d.* 2 *q.*

An Abſtract of the *Douay Catechiſm*, for the Uſe of Childrer and Ignorant People. Now Revis'd, and much Amended *Twenty fours*. Price 2 *d.* ſtitch'd in Blew Paper and cut.

A Paſtoral Letter from the Lord Biſhop of *Meaux*, to the *New Catholics* of his Dioceſs. *Quarto*. Price ſtitch'd 4*d. ob.*

The Anſwer of the *New Converts* of *France*, to a *Paſtoral Letter* from a *Proteſtant Miniſter*. *Quarto*. Price 1 *d.* 2 *q.*

The Ceremonies for the Healing of them that be Diſeaſed with the Kings Evil, uſed in the time of King *Henry* VII. *Quarto* in Latin, Price 4*d.* 2*q.* Engliſh in *Twelves*, Price 2 *d* 2 *q.*

A Short Chriſtian Doctrine. Compoſed by the R. Father *Robert Bellarmin*, of the Society of *Jeſus*, and Cardinal, in *Twelves*. Stitch'd in Blew Paper and cut 2 *d.*

A Vindication of the Biſhop of *Condom*'s Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church. In Anſwer to a Book Entituled, *An Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Church of* England, *&c.* With a Letter from the ſaid Biſhop. *Quarto.* Price ſtitch'd 1 *s.* 2 *d.*

Two Sermons Preach'd before the King and Queen. By the Reverend Father *John Perſall*, of the Society of *Jeſus.* Profeſſor of Divinity. *Quarto.* Price ſtich'd 9 *d.*

The Life of St. *Ignatius*, Founder of the Society of *Jeſus.* In *Octavo.* Price in Quires 1 *s.* 8 *d.* bound 2 *s* 4 *d.*

An Amicable Accommodation of the Difference between the Repreſenter and the Anſwerer, in Return to the Laſt Reply againſt the *Papiſt* Proteſting againſt *Proteſtant Popery.* *Quarto.* Price ſtitch'd 4 *d.* 2 *q.*

D
D 2261

28025

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE

HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION